

justified. They are made in batch operations, requiring the same amount of labor and technical supervision in the United States as in any other country.

Monsanto Chemical Co.'s sales last year were \$341 million, but this total was divided among about 400 products which were sold in some 20,000 formulations. While some products were sold in tank cars in large quantities for as little as \$20 a ton, many others were sold in small amounts, by the pound or gram. The manufacturers' price of cortisone, for example, is \$6.08 a gram, \$2,770 a pound.

With chemical production in most other countries at an alltime high, foreign chemical exports to the United States are on the increase. One direct result to date is the closing of facilities for the production of one Monsanto product. A large investment tested under conditions of a world-surplus now stands idle because a foreign-produced chemical is coming in at a price below Monsanto's cost of manufacture. The price structure of other chemicals also is being threatened.

There is no need to further reduce tariffs at this time. Rather, there is need to test what will happen when present-day tariffs, put into effect when the world's economy was unbalanced and disrupted by war, are type economy such as we are now entering. In other words, it would be wise to see what will happen under the new world conditions before adjusting present tariffs schedules.

There is a maximum amount of each chemical product that can be consumed in this country in a year. For the most part, the American chemical industry can deliver every pound of every product that can be used. If foreign production is added to this, especially at lower prices, then there will be unemployment in the American chemical industry. With such unemployment will come a lessening in the contributions which the United States chemical industry can make to both the peacetime economy and national defense. In a time of national peril, this could prove to be our Achilles heel.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the working men and small businesses of the United States are becoming alarmed at the passive submission to the encroachment of the low-wage countries on the high-living standard markets built up in this Nation by 175 years of competitive business. They demand a flexible duty, or tariff, to make up the differential of cost due to the difference in wages and taxes in this Nation and in the chief competitive countries giving them equal access to our markets, but no advantage.

RECESS

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 6, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 5, 1954:

PATENT OFFICE

Melvin H. Friedman, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner in Chief in the Patent Office, Department of Commerce.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 5, 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Arthur Larson, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Maynard C. Hutchinson, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

Emile A. Pepin, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I.

Burnhard Gettelman, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 37, with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend James A. Bryant, pastor, Wisconsin Avenue Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, the Sovereign of the Universe, we depend altogether upon Thee for wisdom, for strength, for life itself.

Grant the Members of this House—and all others concerned—to know Thy truth, namely: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God."

We have entrusted to them difficult and sometimes impossible tasks. Thou art the God of the impossible, walk by their sides. We trust them and their judgment as they obey Thy will. Energize them by Thy presence.

Show them that they are expendable as they burn out their lives in the service of the greatest nation under the stars. O God, keep America a righteous land. Purge and purify us that we may demonstrate to the suffering world what God will do for his obedient people.

Hear this our prayer through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 2, 1954, was read and approved.

MAHONING AND GRAND RIVER BASIN, OHIO

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have been patiently awaiting a report of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, relating to the Mahoning and Grand River Basin in Ohio.

I had hoped that investigation regarding improvement would include recommendations to provide adequate levels of water in the Berlin Reservoir.

I find from a notice of the report that the existing Berlin Dam is in the comprehensive plan under consideration. However, it is indicated that the storage

capacity of Berlin Reservoir would be essentially as the present allocation.

Mr. Speaker, the present allocation has created a deplorable condition which should not be tolerated in a Federal project. Although for a short period of each year there is water of sufficient quantity to maintain fish and wildlife, together with other recreational activities, most of the year so much of this water is spilled through the dam that thousands of fish die each year and a beautiful recreation area is converted into unsightly and worthless mud flats.

I shall, Mr. Speaker, in the next few days introduce legislation to remedy this situation. If millions of dollars are to be spent on this project, a small portion thereof should and must be used to correct the wrong which has been perpetrated on the people of this area.

I shall call upon the Public Works Committee to conduct an investigation of a proper method to bring to Berlin Reservoir its rightful share of benefits under any proposed plan. I have been advised by engineers this can be done without affecting the effectiveness of the flood-control features of the project.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WILLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1954

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 1469)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) "making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

FRED E. BUSBEY,
HAMER H. BUDGE,
JOHN TABER,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$478,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$542,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the Mexican farm labor program.

In view of the Comptroller General's decision (B-119354, dated April 1, 1954) which provides that the cost of medical examinations may be charged to the employers of Mexican agricultural workers rather than to this appropriation, the conferees are in agreement that the funds allowed will be more than sufficient to permit the opening and operation of the additional station at Hidalgo. Furthermore, the conferees suggest that the Bureau of the Budget review the program with the idea of impounding any funds that may be in excess of minimum requirements in view of the above-mentioned decision and the relatively short period remaining in the fiscal year 1954.

FRED E. BUSBEY,
HAMER H. BUDGE,
JOHN TABER,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this is the supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Labor for carrying out the Mexican labor program. The House at the time the bill was acted upon here provided for \$478,000. The other body raised that amount to \$542,000. The conferees on the part of the other body receded to the House and accepted the House figure of \$478,000. This was done for two reasons. First, approximately 1 month has elapsed since the House action, during which time the program has been dormant, resulting in a saving of approximately \$70,000. Second, the Comptroller General has ruled that the cost of medical examinations of Mexican nationals coming into this country under the program should properly be borne by the employers rather than by appropriations by the Congress. This would result in an additional saving of in excess of \$60,000. For that reason, the House figure has been accepted. There is certainly sufficient money provided in the House figure for the operation of the program, and, as a matter of fact, the conferees have requested the Bureau of the Budget to reconsider this matter to see if some of the funds will not be in excess of what is actually necessary, and to see if the savings should not now be impounded.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] desire time to speak on the conference report?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial about one of the greatest public officials of all time, in my opinion, and certainly the greatest public official I have seen during my years of service here, Comptroller General Lindsay Warren.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PAYMENT OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION ON QUARTERLY BASIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this bill with interested Members, and I ask unanimous consent that it be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.," approved October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 888), is amended by striking out "\$100,000" and by inserting in lieu thereof "\$175,000."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$200,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF HOSPITAL AND HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health

services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TO RELEASE CERTAIN RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN LANDS IN THE CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MONUMENT IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 582) to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING EMERGENCY FOREIGN MERCHANT VESSEL ACQUISITION AND OPERATING AUTHORITY OF PUBLIC LAW 101, 77TH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6318) to extend emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority of Public Law 101, 77th Congress, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would

like to inquire of some member of the committee the necessity for this legislation. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] if he intends to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. FORD. Based on information given me and at the request of my colleague, I had intended to ask to have it passed over.

Mr. McCORMACK. Before that request is made, I might make this observation for the benefit of the gentleman who is handling the bill. What attracts my attention, among other things but particularly, is that this seems to be emergency legislation connected with our national defense, if occasion should arise. It provides that "the President is authorized and empowered"—and that is proper; I am a great believer in delegating the necessary authority to the President—"to purchase, or to requisition, or for any part of such period to charter or requisition the use of, or to take over the title to or possession of, for such use or disposition as he shall direct, any merchant vessel not owned by citizens of the United States which is lying idle in waters within the jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone," and then not "which the President finds to be necessary to national defense," but which the "Secretary finds to be necessary to the national defense."

That is no reflection on the Secretary of Commerce. I know him and I like him very much, although I disagree with him politically, but my observations are not in any way related to the present Secretary of Commerce or any Secretary of Commerce. It would seem like this is delegating to the Secretary of Commerce the question whether it is necessary for the national defense. I think the President or Secretary of Defense should have this delegated power and authority.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. This bill simply makes permanent the provisions of a similar law, Public Law 101 of the 77th Congress, which was emergency legislation. The language of this bill is identical except it does now make it permanent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman say it is identical?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes; it is.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have had a comparison prepared for me by the Library of Congress. Public Law 101 of the 77th Congress authorized the President during the existence of the national emergency declared by him on December 8, 1933, and so forth. It seems to me we are stretching things a little far when we delegate authority to the President to do certain things for the national defense and then have it redelegated further. I can see where the Secretary of Commerce has got to be the administrative unit, so to speak, but then it reads that he may delegate his authority. There is a redelegation of the President's delegation of authority to the extent that the Secretary of Commerce deems it to be necessary for the national defense.

It seems to me no matter what the law provided in the past we ought to delegate the whole thing to the President of the United States. He, in turn, of course, will have it administered, I assume, by the Secretary of Commerce; but the bill as presently worded sort of gives a negative on the part of the Secretary of Commerce on an action that the President might take.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is this the only question the gentleman has?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the only question I am really concerned about now.

The comparison which I referred to is as follows:

COMPARISON OF PUBLIC LAW 101, 77TH CONGRESS (55 STAT. 242) APPROVED JUNE 6, 1941, WITH H. R. 6318, 83D CONGRESS

PUBLIC LAW 101, 77TH CONGRESS (55 STAT. 242), APPROVED JUNE 6, 1941

Section 1

Authorized the President, during the existence of the national emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, but not beyond a certain date (now expired), through such agency or officer as he shall designate, to purchase, requisition, or take over any foreign merchant vessel lying idle in waters within the jurisdiction of the United States, and which is necessary to national defense.

Provided for payment of just compensation to the owner in accordance with section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Such compensation, or advances (see 57 Stat. 48) shall be deposited with the Treasurer, to be available for payment of such compensation and to be applied to payment of valid claims by way of mortgage or lien upon such vessel.

The remainder of section 1 deals with commencement of suits by claimants, procedure where vessel is owned by sovereign nation, or by nation indebted to the United States, and indemnity in the case of persons displaced by the taking of any ship hereunder.

Section 2

Funds appropriated under the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 53), were made available for carrying out the act.

NOTE.—The law as amended omits the term "voluntary agreement of purchase"; however, section 3 (a) authorized the Maritime Commission to charter additional vessels, whether undocumented or documented under the laws of the United States or of a foreign country, during the period of the emergency.

Section 3

(a): Related to chartering of vessels by the Maritime Commission and to private operators who are citizens of the United States on a time-charter or bareboat basis for use in foreign trade, etc.

(b): Related to insurance and reinsurance with respect to vessels chartered.

(c): Provided that act shall not affect provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1939, as amended.

Section 4

Authorized the Maritime Commission to purchase any vessel it is authorized to charter.

Section 5

(a): During the period of the emergency, any vessel acquired by or made available to the Maritime Commission under this act, not documented under the laws of the United States, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, be documented as a vessel of the United States and engage in coastwise trade when so documented; said docu-

H. R. 6318, 83D CONGRESS

Section 1

Authorizes the President, whenever he proclaims that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency proclaimed by him [described in the bill as "any period in which vessels may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 2015, 53 Stat. 1255)] through the Secretary of Commerce, to purchase, requisition, or take over any merchant vessel not owned by citizens of the United States, lying idle in waters within the jurisdiction of the United States, and necessary to the national defense.

Provides for payment of just compensation to the owner in accordance with section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Such compensation or advances shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in a separate fund, from which shall be made, upon the certificate of the Secretary of Commerce, payments for such compensation and for valid claims in accordance with section 902 (d).

[Omitted in bill.]

[Omitted in bill.]

Section 2

During any period described in section 1 above, the President, through the Secretary of Commerce, may acquire the ownership or use of any merchant vessel not owned by citizens of the United States by voluntary agreement of purchase or charter.

See section 2, above.

[Omitted in bill.]

[Omitted in bill.]

[Omitted in bill.]

Section 3

(a): Similar to section 5 (a) of the act, except (1) no period of emergency is prescribed, (2) Secretary of Commerce is inserted in lieu of the Maritime Commission, and (3) the powers vested in the Secretary of Commerce under this subsection of the act are vested in the Secretary of the Treasury under the bill.

PUBLIC LAW 101, 77TH CONGRESS (55 STAT. 242),
APPROVED JUNE 6, 1941

Section 5—Continued

ments to be surrendered at any time surrender is ordered by the Secretary of Commerce. Vessels, whose documents have been ordered surrendered, shall no longer have the status of a vessel of the United States, unless documented anew.

(b): Authorized the President to waive compliance with provisions of law relating to masters, officers, members of the crew, or crew accommodations to such extent as he deems necessary because of lack of facilities of vessels documented hereunder, but no such vessel shall be deprived of the benefits and privileges of United States vessels because of such waiver.

(c): Provided that vessels documented hereunder, when chartered by the Maritime Commission to other Government agencies may engage in coastwise trade under permits authorized to be issued by the Commission.

(d): Exempted vessels chartered to Government agencies or private operators under the provisions of this act, from certain provisions of the Shipping Act of 1916 (U. S. C. 46:808, par. 2) relating to registration and enrollment of such vessels.

(e): Stipulated that laws providing for inspection of steam vessels shall apply to vessels documented under this act only to such extent as may be required by the Board of Supervising Inspectors with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

(f): Authorized the Maritime Commission to repair, reconstruct, or recondition any vessel utilized under this act, and any Government agency acquiring vessels hereunder, may, with the aid of any funds available, repair, etc., such vessels to meet the needs of the services intended.

(g): Provided that the provisions of section 5 of the act should continue in effect in the case of a vessel documented under the section, whose voyage began before the date of termination of the period of the national emergency but was not completed until after such date.

(h): Construed the term "documented to mean "registered," and "enrolled and licensed."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, based on the request of a colleague, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5813) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

H. R. 6318, 83D CONGRESS

Section 3—Continued

(b): Substantially identical with section 5 (b) of the act.

(c): Similar to section 5 (c) of the act except that the Secretary of Commerce is inserted in lieu of the Maritime Commission.

Similar exemption included in section 3 (c) of bill.

Similar provision included in section 3 (c) of bill, except that "Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating" is inserted in lieu of Board of Supervising Inspectors, etc.

(d): Contains provision similar to (f) in the act, except that the authority is vested in the Secretary of Commerce instead of in the Maritime Commission. Subsection (d) also authorizes the Secretary to operate or charter for operation any vessel to be utilized under this act to private operators who are citizens of the United States or to any Government agency, without regard to title VII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which deals with private charter operation.

(e): Similar to subsection (g) except that period of emergency is that described in section 1 of the bill.

(f): Construes the term "documented" to mean "licensed," as well as "registered," or "enrolled and licensed."

INTERSTATE CIVIL-DEFENSE COMPACTS WITH DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 63, authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil-defense compacts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas several States have heretofore entered into interstate civil defense compacts with other States in form substantially as follows:

"INTERSTATE CIVIL DEFENSE AND DISASTER COMPACT

"The contracting States solemnly agree: "Article 1. The purpose of this compact is to provide mutual aid among the States in meeting any emergency or disaster from enemy attack or other cause (natural or otherwise) including sabotage and subversive acts and direct attacks by bombs, shell-fire, and atomic, radiological, chemical, bacteriological means, and other weapons. The prompt, full, and effective utilization of the resources of the respective States, including such resources as may be available from the United States Government or any other source, are essential to the safety, care,

and welfare of the people thereof in the event of enemy action or other emergency, and any other resources, including personnel, equipment, or supplies, shall be incorporated into a plan or plans of mutual aid to be developed among the civil defense agencies or similar bodies of the States that are parties hereto. The directors of civil defense of all party States shall constitute a committee to formulate plans and take all necessary steps for the implementation of this compact.

"Article 2. It shall be the duty of each party State to formulate civil defense plans and programs for application within such State. There shall be frequent consultation between the representatives of the States and with the United States Government and the free exchange of information and plans, including inventories of any material and equipment available for civil defense. In carrying out such civil defense plans and programs the party States shall so far as possible provide and follow uniform standards, practices, and rules and regulations including—

"(a) Insignia, arm bands, and any other distinctive articles to designate and distinguish the different civil defense services;

"(b) Blackouts and practice blackouts, air-raid drills, mobilization of civil defense forces, and other tests and exercises;

"(c) Warnings and signals for drills or attacks and the mechanical devices to be used in connection therewith;

"(d) The effective screening or extinguishing of all lights and lighting devices and appliances;

"(e) Shutting off water mains, gas mains, electric power connections, and the suspension of all other utility services;

"(f) All materials or equipment used or to be used for civil-defense purposes in order to assure that such materials and equipment will be easily and freely interchangeable when used in or by any other party State;

"(g) The conduct of civilians and the movement and cessation of movement of pedestrians and vehicular traffic, prior, during, and subsequent to drills or attacks;

"(h) The safety of public meetings or gatherings; and

"(i) Mobile support units.

"Article 3. Any party State requested to render mutual aid shall take such action as is necessary to provide and make available the resources covered by this compact in accordance with the terms hereof; provided, that it is understood that the State rendering aid may withhold resources to the extent necessary to provide reasonable protection for such State. Each party State shall extend to the civil-defense forces of any other party State, while operating within its State limits under the terms and conditions of this compact, the same powers (except that of arrest unless specifically authorized by the receiving State), duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as if they were performing their duties in the State in which normally employed or rendering services. Civil-defense forces will continue under the command and control of their regular leaders but the organizational units will come under the operational control of the civil-defense authorities of the State receiving assistance.

"Article 4. Whenever any person holds a license, certificate, or other permit issued by any State evidencing the meeting of qualifications for professional, mechanical, or other skills, such person may render aid involving such skill in any party State to meet an emergency or disaster and such State shall give due recognition to such license, certificate, or other permit as if issued in the State in which aid is rendered.

"Article 5. No party State or its officers or employees rendering aid in another State pursuant to this compact shall be liable on

account of any act or omission in good faith on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith.

"Article 6. Inasmuch as it is probable that the pattern and detail of the machinery for mutual aid among two or more States may differ from that appropriate among other States party hereto, this instrument contains elements of a broad base common to all States, and nothing herein contained shall preclude any State from entering into supplementary agreements with another State or States. Such supplementary agreements may comprehend, but shall not be limited to, provisions for evacuation and reception of injured and other persons, and the exchange of medical, fire, police, public utility, reconnaissance, welfare, transportation, and communications personnel, equipment, and supplies.

"Article 7. Each party State shall provide for the payment of compensation and death benefits to injured members of the civil-defense forces of that State and the representatives of deceased members of such forces in case such members sustain injuries or are killed while rendering aid pursuant to this compact, in the same manner and on the same terms as if the injury or death were sustained within such State.

"Article 8. Any party State rendering aid in another State pursuant to this compact shall be reimbursed by the party State receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in the operation of, any equipment answering a request for aid and for the cost incurred in connection with such requests; provided, that any aiding party State may assume in whole or in part such loss, damage, expense, or other cost, or may loan such equipment or donate such services to the receiving party State without charge or cost; and provided further, that any two or more party States may enter into supplementary agreements establishing a different allocation of costs as among those States. The United States Government may relieve the party State receiving aid from any liability and reimburse the party State supplying civil-defense forces for the compensation paid to and the transportation, subsistence, and maintenance expenses of such forces during the time of the rendition of such aid or assistance outside the State and may also pay fair and reasonable compensation for the use or utilization of the supplies, materials, equipment, or facilities so utilized or consumed.

"Article 9. Plans for the orderly evacuation and reception of the civilian population as the result of an emergency or disaster shall be worked out from time to time between representatives of the party States and the various local civil-defense areas thereof. Such plans shall include the manner of transporting such evacuees, the number of evacuees to be received in different areas, the manner in which food, clothing, housing, and medical care will be provided, the registration of the evacuees, the providing of facilities for the notification of relatives or friends, and the forwarding of such evacuees to other areas or the bringing in of additional materials, supplies, and all other relevant factors. Such plans shall provide that the party State receiving evacuees shall be reimbursed generally for the out-of-pocket expenses incurred in receiving and caring for such evacuees, for expenditures for transportation, food, clothing, medicines, and medical care and like items. Such expenditures shall be reimbursed by the party State of which the evacuees are residents, or by the United States Government under plans approved by it. After the termination of the emergency or disaster the party State of which the evacuees are resident shall assume the responsibility for the

ultimate support or repatriation of such evacuees.

"Article 10. This compact shall be available to any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia. The term 'State' may also include any neighboring foreign country or province or state thereof.

"Article 11. The committee established pursuant to Article 1 of this compact may request the Civil Defense Agency of the United States Government to act as an informational and coordinating body under this compact, and representatives of such agency of the United States Government may attend meetings of such committee.

"Article 12. This compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any State as between it and any other State or States so ratifying and shall be subject to approval by Congress unless prior congressional approval has been given. Duly authenticated copies of this compact and of such supplementary agreements as may be entered into shall, at the time of their approval, be deposited with each of the party States and with the Civil Defense Agency and other appropriate agencies of the United States Government.

"Article 13. This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each party State until the legislature or the governor of such party State takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 30 days after notice thereof has been sent by the governor of the party State desiring to withdraw to the governors of all other party States.

"Article 14. This compact shall be construed to effectuate the purposes stated in article 1 hereof. If any provision of this compact is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."; and

Whereas the District of Columbia has been requested by several of the States to enter into such compacts with such States; and

Whereas the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are without authority to enter into such compacts: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into and execute on behalf of the District of Columbia interstate civil-defense compacts with the States, substantially in the form set forth in the preamble of this act. The form of compact set forth in the preamble of this act may include, in lieu of the second sentence of article 3 thereof, the following: "Each party State shall extend to the civil-defense forces of any other party State, while operating within its State limits under the terms and conditions of this compact, the same powers (except that of arrest unless specifically authorized by the receiving State) duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as are extended to the civil-defense forces of such State."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the consent of Congress is hereby granted to each compact entered into by the District of Columbia with any State pursuant to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Whenever any such compact becomes operative by ratification of the parties thereto, such compact shall have the force and effect of law.

SEC. 4. As used in this act the word "State" includes the Territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 8, line 13, after the word "Columbia", insert "and with respect to the District of

Columbia the word 'Governor' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING SECTION 307 OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7308) to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 2297), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING SECTION 1174 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7329) to repeal section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the cooperation of medical officers with line officers in superintending cooking by enlisted men.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ACCEPT AND WEAR CERTAIN FOREIGN DECORATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2247) to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we have an explanation of the necessity for the bill?

MR. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which permits the wearing of foreign decorations. It is primarily aimed at certain decorations which the Republic of Korea wishes to give to some of the soldiers and officers who participated in that war.

MR. GROSS. Is it limited to the Republic of Korea?

MR. JOHNSON of California. No; it is not limited to the Republic of Korea. We gave the bill careful consideration and felt that it is a very fine bill to have.

MR. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. GROSS. I yield.

MR. PRICE. I think, however, it is limited to the Korean war and to decorations of any of the partners in the United Nations effort over there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Russia is a partner in the United Nations; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think she would be apt to give Korean decorations to our men.

Mr. GROSS. But is this strictly limited to the Korean war?

Mr. PRICE. This is limited to decorations awarded by the United Nations to our men during the Korean war.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that following World War II we did pass similar legislation to permit the United States officers and men to wear decorations given by other participating foreign countries?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We did; and then we abrogated it because of the fact that one individual was receiving too many decorations from South America. We want to reopen it now and allow our officers and men to accept and wear decorations presented by our allies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this now permit the awarding of these medals by any nation, a member of the United Nations?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It only applies to the soldiers of those countries who were in the United Nations Command.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The net result of this then is that if Russia wants to award a decoration to an American, he is at liberty to accept it? It seems to me that is a rather peculiar position to get into.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain this.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, Mr. Speaker. I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7774) to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author of the bill or some member of the committee. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the report states this bill will result in no additional cost to the Government; yet, in reading the bill, I find that awards may be made of from \$5,000 to \$25,000. Will the gentleman explain why it does not cost the Government any additional money, if it does not; and if it does, how much?

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. The awards are paid out of the savings made through suggestions of employees of the

Federal Government. If they make a suggestion that will save \$10,000, they might be given an award of \$200 and this is paid out of the saving of \$10,000 which is made due to the suggestion.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The money comes from the employees of the Federal Government and not the Federal Treasury?

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. No, it would not come from the employees; it would come out of the Federal Treasury, but from funds which are actually saved to the Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Who does the money belong to?

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. The money comes out of general appropriations for the operation of an agency. For example, if a suggestion or idea is made which saves \$25,000 of the money originally appropriated for running the agency that much more efficiently and more economically, that money is saved to the Government, it would be saved to the department. From that saving the awards are made for the suggestion that has been given which resulted in the saving.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The rewards are the result of incentive suggestions by employees which in the long run save money for the Government?

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Actually and definitely yes. In 1952 there was a saving of \$33½ million; in 1953 the figure was \$44 million. This measure will result in further incentives to further savings. I think it will result in many more millions of dollars of savings each year.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if there is no objection to immediate consideration of this bill, I propose to offer an amendment which I understand is agreeable to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and also to the author, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, my subcommittee on the Federal Civil Service was established pursuant to House Resolution 32, which authorizes the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies on Federal personnel administrations and to formulate legislative and administrative recommendations for more effective and economical utilization of Federal personnel.

One important project of my subcommittee has been that on incentive awards programs. Last fall, during the recess from the first session of this Congress, members of my subcommittee visited the following cities throughout these United States: Minneapolis, Chicago, Kansas City, Denver, Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Atlanta.

The purpose of these visits was to get out and talk first hand with Federal management officials, personnel officers,

and employees out in the field, to determine how the personnel policies and practices, which were formulated in the central offices here in Washington, were affecting them. Inasmuch as 90 percent of our great Federal work force is located outside of metropolitan Washington, we felt that their views and ideas would be most helpful to us in our determination on how to improve these programs.

I am pleased to report that the response to this field trip was most enthusiastic on the part of all out in the field. Many employees from remote parts of the various States came to the hearings at their own expense to give our committee their comments on the various phases of personnel administration, including incentive awards programs.

Industry representatives also came in, and discussed the administration and operations of similar personnel programs within their respective organizations. Without exception, those industries having incentive awards plans in operation all spoke out about them in terms of glowing praise. They pointed out that their awards were paid on a percentage basis of the actual or estimated dollar savings to their company, and stated that the incidental benefits derived from such programs, such as improved morale and better operating efficiency were of major importance, as well as the primary objective—to save money. One official pointed out that these awards programs were one fine way in which employees could be taken into partnership with management and be made to feel that they were an important part of its operation.

The industry representatives were amazed when informed that all the Federal departments and agencies, except the Defense Department, were presently limited to \$1,000 for an individual cash award, and \$25,000 for an entire Federal department for any one fiscal year. In commenting on this particular point, one industry official reported that awards to his employees were based on 10 percent of the savings, and that his company would like to see its budget soar on incentive awards provided it remained on the same basis. Another industry official stated that he could see no reason for limiting the size of the awards because of the fact that the suggestion benefits might be unusually large. Rather, he felt that just the opposite was true, in that large awards meant that large savings had been realized.

In contrast, the testimony of the Government witnesses indicated that both employees and management manifested only a casual interest in present and existing awards programs. Among the more prevalent reasons for this indifferent attitude and lack of interest were:

First. Employees stated that management had not evidenced any real interest in awards programs and had not encouraged its employees to participate in them. In some instances, they had actually discouraged employees from submitting suggestions. Accordingly, employees could hardly be expected to display any initiative and positive interest in such awards programs.

Second. Among those agencies having programs, management was often very

slow in notifying employees what action it was taking on their suggestions. In fact, on several occasions more than 2 years had elapsed and the employee still had not been informed as to whether or not his suggestion had ever been considered. Such lack of consideration materially hindered the operations of awards programs by stifling employees' incentive to participate in them.

Third, Due to the limitation imposed under Public Law 600 of the 79th Congress, as previously mentioned, decentralized authority to any appreciable degree for the awarding of employees for adopted suggestions has not been granted.

Consideration of this testimony made it evident to my subcommittee and to me that the Federal Government was barely scratching the surface of incentive awards programs. It appeared to us that there was at least two major reasons for this: First, that some Federal management officials had failed to recognize the potential value of such programs, and therefore had not shown the proper interest in them; and second, that the present awards legislation in many instances imposed such rigid limitations on them that they had little or no opportunity to operate an effective awards program, even if they so desired.

The obvious result has been that the majority of these awards programs have bogged down, and in practically no instance has the Federal Government derived the maximum benefits from them. No doubt these are at least two reasons why the employees of two industrial concerns—Eastman Kodak and General Electric—have turned in as many suggestions for 1952 and 1953 as did the entire body of eligible Federal employees, which outnumbered them 10 to 1.

Upon completion of this field trip my Subcommittee on the Federal Civil Service carefully considered the testimony furnished us on incentive awards. In addition, representatives of the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office were called in to give us their views and ideas on how to improve the Government's awards programs. This bill, H. R. 7774, represents the very best combination of all the many fine ideas and suggestions received and considered by us from all of these different sources.

Section 2 of this bill will for the first time permit wage board employees to participate in a uniform awards program. In at least one defense component, the Department of the Navy, the majority of its employees fall into the wageboard category, so the potential value of this extended coverage is obvious. The postal field employees are another major group numbering almost 500,000 which will be included under the provisions of this legislation.

Section 3 of this bill imposes a duty on each administrator to establish an awards program for his agency and to actively promote it. The Civil Service Commission is charged with the responsibility for making certain that these duties are carried out, and are further charged with the duty of providing the proper stimulus to make these programs operate effectively.

My subcommittee and I intend to watch this particular activity with a great deal of interest because we hope and expect the Commission to stir these awards programs out of their present lethargical state and arouse active interest and participation in them, so that the Federal Government might ultimately derive maximum cash savings and other benefits commensurate with that presently enjoyed in industry.

I want to emphasize at this point that section 3 (a) of this bill will permit departments and agencies to continue the practice of granting length-of-service awards for longevity as is presently done under authority of Public Law 600 of the 79th Congress, because we feel that the recognition of long and faithful service is an important additional incentive to efficient work performance by employees.

Section 4 authorizes departments to pay cash awards and grant honorary recognition for suggestions, inventions, superior accomplishments, or other meritorious personal efforts. This section permits individual administrators to authorize single awards up to \$5,000, and permits the Civil Service Commission to authorize single awards up to \$25,000, where they have determined that the basis therefor is highly exceptional and unusually outstanding. In addition, this section permits more than one department to share in the payment of a cash award, with the office of the President being designated to determine each department's proportionate amount. The President of the United States also is authorized to grant both honorary and cash awards in addition to those granted by the departments. Accordingly, I feel that this section materially liberalizes the granting of individual awards, and should go far in removing one present objection, namely, that inadequate recognition is all that often can be shown due to statutory limitations.

The practice of paying awards from general appropriations, based on a percentage of savings resulting from the adopted suggestion, will be continued in this legislation. My subcommittee and I both hope that these cash awards budgets will be materially increased as it has in industry, because that will mean increased savings for the Federal Government. I feel that this is of major importance, in view of the fact that many of our Federal agencies are operating on reduced appropriations, or on an increased workload with no additional funds, and at the same time, are expected to perform their functions with the same degree of efficiency. I believe that this bill will be of valuable assistance to them in meeting this responsibility.

In fact, I sincerely believe that this legislation, H. R. 7774, will eliminate all of the obstacles I have previously referred to, and will provide departments and agencies for the first time with an improved management tool which will help them establish effective incentive-awards programs from which the Federal Government can derive maximum benefits such as improved morale, greater operating efficiency, and last, but most important of all, cash savings expected to run into many more millions of dollars annually.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Incentive Awards Act of 1954."

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this act—
(a) The term "department" or "Government" includes (1) the executive departments, (2) the independent establishments and agencies in the executive branch, including corporations wholly owned by the United States, (3) the Library of Congress, (4) the Government Printing Office, (5) the General Accounting Office, and (6) the municipal government of the District of Columbia;

(b) The term "employees" includes all civilian officers and employees in or under the departments;

(c) The term "Commission" means the United States Civil Service Commission.

Sec. 3. (a) The head of each department shall prepare an incentive-awards plan for his department in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Commission. The incentive-awards plan of each department shall provide that the head of such department shall grant monetary awards, or provide suitable honorary recognition, or both, in his discretion, to or for employees of the Government (or the former employees or the estates of deceased employees thereof) in those instances in which such persons, while employed by the Government, have contributed to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of the operations of such department, or of any other department, by their suggestions, inventions, superior accomplishments, or other meritorious personal efforts.

(b) The Commission shall inspect and review the operation of the incentive-awards plans in the departments to insure compliance with the provisions of this act and with the standards and regulations of the Commission. The Commission is authorized, on its own initiative and after consultation with the department concerned, to revise or modify any department's plan to the extent the Commission deems necessary.

(c) In order to carry out effectively the purposes of this act, the Commission shall establish under its jurisdiction an incentive-awards office, appoint a director thereof, and, consistently with the provisions of this act, delegate to such director the duty and responsibility imposed upon the Commission under subsection (a) to the extent that the Commission may deem necessary.

(d) The director of the incentive-awards office shall be immediately responsible to, and shall report directly to, the executive director of the Commission.

(e) The Commission shall submit to the Congress and to the respective chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, an annual report of the operation of the program of incentive-awards plans for the departments under this act, together with such recommendations as the Commission deems advisable.

Sec. 4. (a) Awards and expenses for honorary recognition under section 3 of this act may be paid from funds or appropriations of the department primarily benefiting or may be paid from the several funds or appropriations of the various departments benefiting.

(b) A monetary award granted under an incentive-awards plan shall not exceed \$5,000, except that an award in excess of such amount may be granted, with the approval of the Commission, in special cases in which the head of a department certifies to the

Commission that the idea, method, or device for which such award is proposed to be made is highly exceptional and unusually outstanding.

(c) The acceptance of a monetary award shall constitute an agreement that the use by the United States of any idea, method, or device for which the award is made shall not form the basis of a claim of any nature against the United States or the District of Columbia by the employee or former employee, or his heirs, assigns, or estate.

(d) A monetary award or honorary recognition shall be given due weight in qualifying and selecting employees for promotion.

Sec. 5. (a) The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) Sections 702, 1002, and 1003 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C., secs. 1122, 1152, 1153);

(2) Section 14 of the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 116a);

(3) The act entitled "An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions," approved December 3, 1945 (39 U. S. C., sec. 813);

(4) The act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to pay a cash award for suggestions submitted by employees of certain establishments of the Ordnance Department for improvement or economy in manufacturing process or plant," approved July 17, 1912 (50 U. S. C., sec. 58);

(5) The act entitled "An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior," approved June 20, 1944 (5 U. S. C., sec. 500);

(6) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 35 of the act entitled "An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1946, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 416); and

(7) The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities," approved March 13, 1944 (46 U. S. C., sec. 1111b).

(b) All other laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

(c) Paragraph (A) of subsection (a) of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 1121 (a)), is amended by striking out the comma and the following: "except increase made pursuant to section 702 or 1002."

Sec. 6. The enactment of this act shall not affect the right of any employee to an award granted him under any provision of law repealed by this act.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 8. This act shall take effect on the 90th day after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "or the former" and insert in lieu thereof "or to former."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "subsection (a)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections (a) and (b)."

Page 3, strike out subsection (e) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) The Commission shall include in its annual report to the Congress a statement with respect to the operation of the program of incentive awards plans for the departments under this act, together with such recommendations as the Commission may deem advisable."

Page 4, line 3, after the period insert the following sentence:

"The President of the United States shall determine the proportionate share of each respective benefiting department."

Page 4, line 6, after the word "amount", insert "but not in excess of \$25,000."

Page 4, at lines 8 and 9, strike out "idea, method, or device" and insert in lieu thereof "suggestion, invention, superior accomplishment, or other meritorious effort."

Page 4, line 11, subsection (c) of the introduced bill is redesignated as subsection (d), and is amended by striking out "the use by the United States of any idea, method, or device" and inserting in lieu thereof "any benefit derived by the United States or the District of Columbia as a result of the suggestion, invention, superior accomplishment, or other meritorious personal effort."

Page 4, insert after line 10 the following subsection:

"(c) The President of the United States is authorized to pay monetary awards to, and to incur necessary expenses for the honorary recognition of, civilian officers and employees of the Government who by their suggestions, inventions, superior accomplishments, or other personal efforts contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvements of Government operations, or who perform exceptionally meritorious special acts or services in the public interest in connection with or related to their official employment. Such Presidential awards may be in addition to departmental awards authorized in section 3 (a)."

Page 4, line 17, subsection (d) is redesignated as subsection (e).

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: On page 1, line 9, after the words "United States", insert a comma and the following: "but not including the Tennessee Valley Authority."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL LANDS SHALL VEST IN THE STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7110) to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

OFFICE EXPENSES OF FULL-TIME UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5801) to provide that United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the duties of the office may be allowed their necessary office expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my purpose to object to this bill. If there is any Member here who is interested in it, I would be glad to discuss it and give my reasons. I object to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

FILING CERTAIN CLAIMS UNDER THE WAR CLAIMS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6896) to extend the period for filing claims for compensation by World War II prisoners of war to August 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and, of course, I shall not, but I want to make some inquiries. Is the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] prepared to answer a question or two?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I may be able to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reading this bill, might I say to my friend, my mind was directed toward the fact that this is limited to an extension until July 1, 1954. Of course, this is April 5, 1954, now. Naturally, it will take a little longer to become law, since it has to pass the other body. Does the gentleman think the remaining period is long enough? Does not the gentleman think it should be extended to December 31 of this year to give them an opportunity to file, because the time is rather short? The period is practically at hand now.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is the author of this bill. He is unable to be here this morning and asked me to appear. May I further say to the gentleman that I think the time provided for filing claims in the bill is too short. It was my understanding that there would be an amendment offered to the bill extending the time. I think an amendment should be offered extending the time at least to November 1 or something more reasonable to give an opportunity to file claims.

Mr. McCORMACK. The committee amendment was to cut down from August 1 to July 1. It seems to me that since it is now April 5 and then the bill having to go over to the other body and be acted upon, that this is a very short period. If the gentleman thinks that the period is long enough, I will accept the gentleman's word. On the other hand, we know that time passes very rapidly, and it may be only 2 months at the most for the veterans who have not exercised their rights, to do so. If the gentleman has no objection, I will offer an amendment striking out July 1 and making it December 31, and then if a shorter period would be satisfactory, that could be arranged in the other body, so that we will not have to put this over today for 2 weeks longer.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would have been satisfied with November 1.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I will take November 1.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to amend section 6 and 77 of the War Claims Act of 1948", approved April 9, 1952, is amended by striking out "within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act", and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before August 1, 1954."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall not be construed to extend the life of the War Claims Commission for any period of time.

SEC. 3. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of April 9, 1953.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "section 6 and 77" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 6 and 7."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "August" and insert "July."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 1, line 7, strike out "July" and insert "November."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF U. S. S. "CONSTITUTION," ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8247) to provide for the restoration and maintenance of the U. S. S. *Constitution* and to authorize the disposition of the U. S. S. *Constellation*, U. S. S. *Hartford*, U. S. S. *Olympia*, and U. S. S. *Oregon*, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

MARKERS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4690) to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the chairman of the committee or some other member could tell us whether any information was obtained in the hearings on this particular measure as to whether the bodies of American boys still in North Korea will be recovered and when, if ever.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is not to move any bodies. It is to erect appropriate markers.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that perfectly, but I wondered if any information was obtained from those who testified on this bill as to when those bodies will be recovered, if ever.

Mr. D'EWARD. That was not gone into in the hearings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army shall set aside, when available, suitable plots in the national cemeteries under their jurisdiction to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action, and shall, under regulations to be jointly prescribed by them, permit the erection of appropriate markers thereon in honor of any such member or group of members.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AFFECTING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2225) to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in all cases where relief has been granted or may hereafter be granted to disbursing officers or agents of any of the departments or agencies of the Federal Government operating under accounts of advances, under the authority of any act containing no provisions for the removal of charges outstanding in the accounts of advances of such departments or agencies, and in all cases where charges have been outstanding in the accounts of advances of the aforesaid departments or agencies for two fiscal years and have been certified by the head of the department or agency concerned to the Comptroller General as uncollectible, such charges shall be removed by crediting the appropriate account of advances and debiting any appropriation made available therefor to the department or agency concerned: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall in any way affect the financial liability of any disbursing officer, agent, or surety of the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, 898), is hereby amended by deleting the period after the word "loaned" and substituting a colon in place thereof, and by adding the following proviso thereto: "*Provided, however*, That claims for the return or replacement of binoculars under this section shall be filed with the Secretary of the Navy on or before December 31, 1953, and the United States shall be under no obligation to return, replace, or pay for binoculars under this section, for which no claim is so filed. After decision on claims submitted pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to dispose of any such binoculars held by the Navy in accordance with existing law."

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to sell to merchant ships, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and at such prices as he may deem reasonable, such fuel and other supplies as may be required to meet the necessities of, and as may not otherwise be locally procured by, such ships: *Provided*, That such ships, without such fuel or other supplies to be furnished under this

authority, are not able to proceed to the nearest port where such fuel and other supplies can be locally procured without endangering the health and comfort of the personnel, the safety of the ship, or the safe condition of the property thereon: *Provided further*, That the funds received from such sales shall, if not otherwise provided by law, be credited to the current appropriations concerned, and the amounts so credited shall be available for expenditures for the same purposes as the appropriations credited.

SEC. 4. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, appropriations chargeable for the transportation of baggage and household goods and effects of military personnel and civilian employees of departments or agencies of the Federal Government shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of general average contributions required in connection therewith.

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296, 297), as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting in the seventh sentence thereof, after "those which cannot be finished without great and disproportionate expense," the following: "or those which have become excess to the needs of the United States Navy for the performance of its functions."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in all cases where relief has been granted or may hereafter be granted to disbursing officers or agents of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department operating under accounts of advances, under the authority of any act of Congress containing no provisions for the removal of charges outstanding in the accounts of advances of such departments, and in all cases where charges have been outstanding in the accounts of advances of the aforesaid departments for 2 full fiscal years and have been certified by the head of the department concerned to the Comptroller General as uncollectible, such charges shall be removed by crediting the appropriate account of advances and debiting any appropriation made available therefor to the department concerned: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall in any way affect the financial liability of any disbursing officer, agent, or surety of the United States."

"SEC. 2. Section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, 898), is hereby amended by deleting the period after the word 'loaned' and substituting a colon in place thereof, and by adding the following proviso thereto: '*Provided, however*, That claims for the return or replacement of binoculars under this section shall be filed with the Secretary of the Navy on or before December 31, 1954, and the United States shall be under no obligation to return, replace, or pay for binoculars under this section, for which no claim is so filed. After decision on claims submitted pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to dispose of any such binoculars held by the Navy in accordance with existing law.'

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to sell to merchant ships under such regulations as he may prescribe, and at such prices as he may deem reasonable, such fuel and other supplies as may be required to meet the necessities of such ships and as may not otherwise be locally procurable: *Provided*, That such ships, without such fuel or other emergency supplies to be furnished under this authority, are not able to proceed to the nearest port where such fuel and other supplies can be locally procured without endangering the health and comfort of the personnel, the safety of the ship, or the safe condition of the property thereon: *Provided further*, That the funds received from such sales shall, if not otherwise provided by law, be credited to the

current appropriations concerned, and the amounts so credited shall be available for expenditures for the same purposes as the appropriations credited.

"Sec. 4. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, appropriations chargeable for the transportation of baggage and household goods and effects of military personnel and civilian employees of departments or agencies of the Federal Government shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of general average contributions required in connection therewith: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of general average contributions required in connection with and applicable to quantities of baggage and household goods and effects in excess of quantities authorized to be transported by law or regulation pursuant to law; nor shall any appropriation be so available in any case where the military person or civilian employee concerned (a) is allowed under any law or regulation pursuant to law a commutation in lieu of the actual transportation expenses or (b) has himself selected the means of shipment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5605) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that transfers of real property from certain Government corporations to other Government agencies shall not operate to remove such real property from local tax rolls.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1456) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out clauses (2) and (3) of section 1 of said act and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and (2) that the said Gorgas Memorial Institute be, and it is hereby, authorized within its discretion, henceforth to accept from any of the

Latin American Governments, or from any other sources, any funds which may be offered or given for the use of the Gorgas Memorial Institute for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, and for carrying on the work of said Laboratory wherever deemed by the said Institute to be necessary or desirable."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONVEYING PROPERTY TO CITY OF BOULDER, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7380) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio propagation laboratory.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to reconvey, without compensation in such manner and on such other terms and conditions as he deems to be in the best interests of the United States, to the city of Boulder, Colo., 2 acres of land more or less, consisting of a portion of a tract of some 210 acres of land in Boulder County, Colo., which tract was conveyed without compensation to the United States Government represented by the Secretary of Commerce, as a site for a radio laboratory under authority of Public law 366, 81st Congress, approved October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 886), the said land reconveyed to be used by the city of Boulder, Colo., as part of a site for a water reservoir.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINALITY CLAUSES IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 24) to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts, in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RAILWAY INSTALLATIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL, NEW ORLEANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6870) to amend the act of February 13, 1900 (31 Stat. 28) by approving existing railway installations and authorizing further railway installations on the batture in front of the Public Health Service hospital property in New Orleans, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of Congress approved February 13, 1900 (31 Stat. 28), granting permission and authority to the Orleans levee board to move, without cost to the United States, the existing line of levee in front of the Public Health Service hospital property in New Or-

leans, La., and for other purposes, be amended so as to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) That permission and authority be, and they are hereby, granted to the Orleans levee board to move, without cost to the United States, the existing line of levee in front of the United States Public Health Service hospital property in New Orleans, La., in the square bounded by State Street, Henry Clay Avenue, Tchoupitoulas Street, and the Mississippi River; said line of levee to be moved outwardly in the direction of said river to the new line of levee established by the said Orleans levee board, and that the city of New Orleans be, and it is hereby, authorized to extend, lay out, open, and to keep open, through the said Public Health Service hospital property, the street known as Leake Avenue (Front Street), 110 feet wide, extending from Peniston Street to the upper limits of the city of New Orleans, a distance of about 5 miles, as provided for under ordinance of the city of New Orleans, numbered 15,080, council series, approved March 1, 1899: *Provided*, That in case the said city of New Orleans has granted, or shall grant, a right-of-way over said street to any railway company, corporation, firm, or person, or that said street shall be used for railway purposes, such grant, privilege, or use shall be upon condition that no part of said street within the limits of said Public Health Service hospital property (or within 1,000 feet from the same) shall be used for depot purposes, or railroad yard, or for the purposes of switching, shifting, or parking cars, or making up or breaking up trains of cars, or for any other purpose than the ordinary transit, without stopping, of railway trains excepting, however, the stopping of cars by reason of the automatic interlocking located at the intersection of the tracks of the Illinois Central Railroad and the Public Belt Railroad Commission between Jefferson Avenue and Octavia Street when the crossing is occupied by opposing trains: *And provided further*, That the inner line of said Leake Avenue (Front Street) shall not be located at any point nearer than eight feet to the present iron fence enclosing the grounds of said Public Health Service hospital property; and the violation of any of the provisions of this act shall, as to the person, company, railway company, municipal corporation, or other corporation so violating any of said provisions, cause a revocation of all rights and privileges given or granted by this act.

"(b) The existing railway side tracks and related rail facilities of the Public Belt Railroad Commission, the following-described center lines of which are located within the area set forth in paragraph (a) hereof are hereby approved: as shown on Public Belt Railroad Plan No. A-14-57, revised July 6, 1953.

"(1) A certain track designated as 'old Mengel Switch,' beginning at a point designated 'E' approximately 15 feet riverward from Public Belt river main track, said point 'E' being 1,000 feet in an upstream direction from the northeast corner of Henry Clay Avenue and Leake Avenue; then by a line bearing approximately south forty-two degrees east, a distance of approximately forty-seven feet; thence by a twelve-degree thirty-minute curve to the left, a distance of approximately eighty feet; thence by a line approximately twenty-six feet riverward from and parallel to Public Belt river main track bearing approximately south fifty degrees east, a distance of approximately three hundred feet to point designated 'F,' the end of the existing track, said point 'F' being approximately six hundred feet from the northeast corner of Henry Clay Avenue and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(2) A certain track designated as 'number 1,' beginning at a point designated by

the letter 'G,' said point 'G' being on Public Belt river main track at a distance of approximately two hundred and seventy-eight feet upstream from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line; thence by a number 7 turnout and curve to the right, a distance of approximately ninety feet in a downstream direction; thence by a ten-degree curve to the left, a distance of approximately two hundred and thirty feet in a downstream direction; thence by a line bearing approximately north eighty-nine degrees east, thirteen feet riverward from and parallel to Public Belt river main track, a distance of approximately nine hundred and sixty-five feet to point designated 'H,' said point 'H' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(3) A certain track designated as 'number 2', beginning at a point designated 'J', said point designated 'J' being on track number 1 approximately five hundred and thirty feet downstream from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line; thence by a number 7 turnout to the right, a distance of approximately seventy feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south eight-two degrees east, a distance of approximately forty-eight feet; thence by a twenty-four degree thirty minute curve to the left, a distance of approximately forty-five feet; thence by a line approximately sixteen feet riverward from and parallel to track number 1 bearing approximately north eighty-nine degrees east, a distance of approximately two hundred feet; thence by a twenty-four degree thirty minute curve to the right, a distance of approximately sixty feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south seventy-nine degrees east, a distance of approximately fifty feet to point designated 'K', said point designated 'K' being one thousand feet downstream from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(4) A certain track designated as 'track number 3', beginning at a point designated by the letter 'L', said point 'L' being on aforesaid track number 2, at a point approximately eight hundred and twenty feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line; thence by a number 5 turnout to the right, a distance of approximately fifty feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south seventy-nine degrees east, a distance of one hundred and twenty-five feet to a point designated 'M', said point 'M' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(5) A certain track designated as 'track number 4', beginning on track number 2 at a point designated by the letter 'N', said point 'N' being approximately seven hundred and fifty-six feet downstream from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line; thence by a number 5 turnout to the right, a distance of approximately fifty feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south seventy-nine degrees east, a distance of approximately one hundred and ninety-two feet to point designated 'O', said point 'O' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(6) A certain track designated as 'track number five', beginning at a point on track number 2, designated by the letter 'P', said point 'P' being approximately six hundred and ninety feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line; thence by a number 5 turnout to the right, a distance of approximately fifty feet;

thence by a line bearing approximately south seventy-nine degrees east, a distance of approximately two hundred and fifty-eight feet to point designated 'Q', said point 'Q' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(7) A certain track designated as 'track number six', beginning at a point on track number 1, designated by the letter 'R', said point 'R' being approximately one hundred and thirty feet from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured in a southwesterly direction along a straight line; thence by a number 7 turnout to the right, a distance of approximately eighty feet in a downstream direction, thence by a ten degree curve to the left, a distance of approximately one hundred and thirty-eight feet; thence by a line approximately eighteen feet riverward from and parallel to track number 1 bearing approximately north eighty-nine degrees east, a distance of approximately three hundred and seventy feet; thence by a twelve degree thirty minute curve to the right a distance of approximately sixty-five feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south eighty-two degrees east, a distance of approximately three hundred twelve feet; thence by an eight degree curve to the right, a distance of approximately eighty-three feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south seventy-seven degrees east, a distance of approximately forty-two feet to point designated 'S', said point 'S' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(8) A certain track designated as 'track number seven', beginning at a point on track number 6, designated by the letter 'T', said point 'T' being approximately one hundred and thirty feet from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured in a southeasterly direction along a straight line; thence by a number 7 turnout to the right, a distance of approximately ninety-two feet; thence by a twelve degree thirty minute curve to the left, a distance of approximately seventy-nine feet; thence by a line thirteen feet riverward from and parallel to track number 1, bearing approximately north eighty-nine degrees east, a distance of approximately two hundred and sixty feet; thence by a twelve degree thirty minute curve to the right, a distance of approximately sixty-three feet; thence by a line thirteen feet riverward from and parallel to track number 6 bearing south eighty-two degrees east, a distance of approximately two hundred and twenty feet; thence by an eight degree curve to the right, a distance of approximately eighty-five feet; thence by a line approximately nineteen feet riverward from and parallel to track number 6 bearing approximately south seventy-seven degrees east, a distance of approximately one hundred and twenty-eight feet to point designated 'U', said point 'U' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(c) The public-belt railroad commission is authorized to install two railway tracks and related railway facilities to serve the proposed Nashville Avenue wharf within the area described in paragraph (a) hereof, the center lines of which railway tracks are substantially as hereinafter described: *Provided*, That the switching of cars for the purpose of servicing the proposed Nashville Avenue wharf shall be permitted only between the hours of 6 o'clock antemeridian and 8 o'clock postmeridian.

"(1) Beginning at the end of the existing Old Mengel Switch at point designated 'F', said point 'F' being approximately six hundred feet upstream from the northeast corner

of Henry Clay Avenue and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line; thence by a line bearing approximately south fifty degrees east, a distance of approximately three hundred and twenty feet; thence by a three degree curve to the left, a distance of approximately one hundred and eighteen feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south fifty-four degrees east, a distance of approximately one thousand two hundred and seventy feet; thence by a twelve degree thirty minute curve to the left, a distance of approximately one hundred and seventy feet; thence by a line bearing approximately south seventy-five degrees east, a distance of approximately ninety-two feet; thence by a twelve degree thirty minute curve to the left, a distance of approximately sixty-six feet; thence by a line seven feet cityward from and parallel to the rear apron of the proposed Nashville Avenue wharf, bearing approximately south eighty-three degrees east, a distance of approximately six hundred and forty feet to a point designated 'V', said point 'V' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line.

"(2) Beginning at a point on the proposed track to serve proposed Nashville Avenue wharf, previously described, at a point designated by the letter 'W', said point 'W' being approximately six hundred feet from the northwest corner of Leake Avenue and State Street, measured in a southerly direction along a straight line; thence by a number 7 turnout to the left, a distance of approximately eighty feet; thence by a line twenty feet cityward from and parallel to the rear apron of the proposed Nashville Avenue wharf bearing approximately south eighty-three degrees east, a distance of approximately seven hundred and twenty-five feet to point designated 'X', said point 'X' being one thousand feet in a downstream direction from the northwest corner of State Street and Leake Avenue, measured along a straight line."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 18, after the word "That", insert the following: "(1) the type of construction and elevation of all tracks crossing the main line Mississippi River levee shall be subject to approval by the Corps of Engineers United States Army, and (2)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7125) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(g) The term 'pesticide chemical' means any substance which, alone, in chemical combination or in formulation with one or more other substances, is an 'economic poison' within the meaning of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C., secs. 135-135k) as now in force or as hereafter amended, and which is used in the production, storage, or transportation of raw agricultural commodities.

"(r) The term 'raw agricultural commodity' means any food in its raw or natural state, including all fruits that are washed, colored, or otherwise treated in their unpeeled natural form prior to marketing."

SEC. 2. Clause (2) of section 402 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended to read as follows: "(2) if it bears or contains any added poisonous or added deleterious substance, except a pesticide chemical in or on a raw agricultural commodity, which is unsafe within the meaning of section 406, or if it is a raw agricultural commodity and it bears or contains a pesticide chemical which is unsafe within the meaning of section 408 (a);".

SEC. 3. Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TOLERANCES FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICALS IN OR ON RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES"

"SEC. 408. (a) Any poisonous or deleterious pesticide chemical, or any pesticide chemical which is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of pesticide chemicals, as safe for use, added to a raw agricultural commodity, shall be deemed unsafe for the purposes of the application of clause (2) of section 402 (a) unless—

"(1) a tolerance for such pesticide chemical in or on the raw agricultural commodity has been prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under this section and the quantity of such pesticide chemical is within the limits of the tolerance so prescribed; or

"(2) with respect to use in or on such raw agricultural commodity, the pesticide chemical has been exempted from the requirement of a tolerance by the Secretary under this section.

While a tolerance or exemption from tolerance is in effect for a pesticide chemical with respect to any raw agricultural commodity, such raw agricultural commodity shall not, by reason of bearing or containing any added amount of such pesticide chemical, be considered to be adulterated within the meaning of clause (1) of section 402 (a).

"(b) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations establishing tolerances with respect to the use in or on raw agricultural commodities of poisonous or deleterious pesticide chemicals and of pesticide chemicals which are not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of pesticide chemicals, as safe for use, to the extent necessary to protect the public health. In establishing any such regulation, the Secretary shall give appropriate consideration, among other relevant factors, (1) to the necessity for the production of an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply; (2) to the other ways in which the consumer may be affected by the same pesticide chemical or by other related substances that are poisonous or deleterious; and (3) to the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture as submitted with a certification of usefulness under subsection (1) of this section. Such regulations shall be promulgated in the manner prescribed in subsection (d) or (e) of this section. In carrying out the provisions of this section relating to the establishment of tolerances, the Secretary may establish the tolerance applicable with respect to the use of any pesticide chemical in or on any raw agricultural commodity at zero level if the scientific data before the Secretary does not justify the establishment of a greater tolerance.

"(c) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting any pesticide chemical from the necessity of a tolerance with respect to use in or on any or all raw agricultural commodities when such a tolerance

is not necessary to protect the public health. Such regulations shall be promulgated in the manner prescribed in subsection (d) or (e) of this section.

"(d) (1) Any person who has registered, or who has submitted an application for the registration of, an economic poison under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act may file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a petition proposing the issuance of a regulation establishing a tolerance for a pesticide chemical which constitutes, or is an ingredient of, such economic poison, or exempting the pesticide chemical from a tolerance. The petition shall contain data showing—

"(A) the name, chemical identity, and composition of the pesticide chemical;

"(B) the amount, frequency, and time of application of the pesticide chemical;

"(C) full reports of investigations made with respect to the safety of the pesticide chemical;

"(D) the results of tests on the amount of residue remaining, including a description of the analytical methods used;

"(E) practicable methods for removing residue which exceeds any proposed tolerance;

"(F) proposed tolerances for the pesticide chemical if tolerances are proposed; and

"(G) reasonable grounds in support of the petition. Samples of the pesticide chemical shall be furnished to the Secretary upon request. Notice of the filing of such petition shall be published in general terms by the Secretary within 30 days after filing. Such notice shall include the analytical methods available for the determination of the residue of the pesticide chemical for which a tolerance or exemption is proposed.

"(2) Within 90 days after a certification of usefulness by the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (1) with respect to the pesticide chemical named in the petition, the Secretary shall, after giving due consideration to the data submitted in the petition or otherwise before him, by order make public a regulation—

"(A) establishing a tolerance for the pesticide chemical named in the petition for the purposes for which it is so certified as useful, or

"(B) exempting the pesticide chemical from the necessity of a tolerance for such purposes,

unless within such 90-day period the person filing the petition requests that the petition be referred to an advisory committee or the Secretary within such period otherwise deems such referral necessary, in either of which event the provisions of paragraph (3) of this subsection shall apply in lieu hereof.

"(3) In the event that the person filing the petition requests, within 90 days after a certification of usefulness by the Secretary of Agriculture under subsection (1) with respect to the pesticide chemical named in the petition, that the petition be referred to an advisory committee, or the Secretary within such period otherwise deems such referral necessary, the Secretary shall forthwith submit the petition and other data before him to an advisory committee to be appointed in accordance with subsection (g) of this section. As soon as practicable after such referral, but not later than 60 days thereafter, unless extended as hereinafter provided, the committee shall, after independent study of the data submitted to it by the Secretary and other data before it, certify to the Secretary a report and recommendations on the proposal in the petition to the Secretary, together with all underlying data and a statement of the reasons or basis for the recommendations. The 60-day period provided for herein may be extended by the advisory committee for an additional 30 days if the advisory committee deems this necessary. Within 30 days after such certification, the Secretary shall, after giving due considera-

tion to all data then before him, including such report, recommendations, underlying data, and statement, by order make public a regulation—

"(A) establishing a tolerance for the pesticide chemical named in the petition for the purposes for which it is so certified as useful; or

"(B) exempting the pesticide chemical from the necessity of a tolerance for such purposes.

"(4) The regulations published under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection will be effective upon publication.

"(5) Within 30 days after publication, any person adversely affected by a regulation published pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection, or pursuant to subsection (e), may file objections thereto with the Secretary, specifying with particularity the provisions of the regulation deemed objectionable, stating reasonable grounds therefor, and requesting a public hearing upon such objections. A copy of the objections filed by a person other than the petitioner shall be served on the petitioner, if the regulation was issued pursuant to a petition. The petitioner shall have 2 weeks to make a written reply to the objections. The Secretary shall thereupon, after due notice, hold such public hearing for the purpose of receiving evidence relevant and material to the issues raised by such objections. Any report, recommendations, underlying data, and reasons certified to the Secretary by an advisory committee shall be made a part of the record of the hearing, if relevant and material, subject to the provisions of section 7 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 1006 (c)). The National Academy of Sciences shall designate a member of the advisory committee to appear and testify at any such hearing with respect to the report and recommendations of such committee upon request of the Secretary, the petitioner, or the officer conducting the hearing: *Provided*, That this shall not preclude any other member of the advisory committee from appearing and testifying at such hearing. As soon as practicable after completion of the hearing, the Secretary shall act upon such objections and by order make public a regulation. Such regulation shall be based only on substantial evidence of record at such hearing, including any report, recommendations, underlying data, and reasons certified to the Secretary by an advisory committee, and shall set forth detailed findings of fact upon which the regulation is based. No such order shall take effect prior to the ninetieth day after its publication, unless the Secretary finds that emergency conditions exist necessitating an earlier effective date, in which event the Secretary shall specify in the order his findings as to such conditions.

"(e) The Secretary may at any time, upon his own initiative or upon the request of any interested person, propose the issuance of a regulation establishing a tolerance for a pesticide chemical or exempting it from the necessity of a tolerance. Thirty days after publication of such a proposal, the Secretary may by order publish a regulation based upon the proposal which shall become effective upon publication unless within such 30-day period a person, who has registered, or who has submitted an application for the registration of, an economic poison under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act containing the pesticide chemical named in the proposal, requests that the proposal be referred to an advisory committee. In the event of such a request, the Secretary shall forthwith submit the proposal and other relevant data before him to an advisory committee to be appointed in accordance with subsection (g) of this section. As soon as practicable after such referral, but not later than 60 days thereafter, unless extended as hereinafter provided, the committee shall, after independent study of the data

submitted to it by the Secretary and other data before it, certify to the Secretary a report and recommendations on the proposal together with all underlying data and a statement of the reasons or basis for the recommendations. The 60-day period provided for herein may be extended by the advisory committee for an additional 30 days if the advisory committee deems this necessary. Within 30 days after such certification, the Secretary may, after giving due consideration to all data before him, including such report, recommendations, underlying data and statement, by order publish a regulation establishing a tolerance for the pesticide chemical named in the proposal or exempting it from the necessity of a tolerance which shall become effective upon publication. Regulations issued under this subsection shall upon publication be subject to paragraph (5) or subsection (d).

"(f) All data submitted to the Secretary, or to an advisory committee in support of a petition under this section shall be considered confidential by the Secretary and by such advisory committee until publication of a regulation under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (d) of this section. Until such publication, such data shall not be revealed to any person other than those authorized by the Secretary or by an advisory committee in the carrying out of their official duties under this section.

"(g) Whenever the referral of a petition or proposal to an advisory committee is requested under this section, or the Secretary otherwise deems such referral necessary the Secretary shall forthwith appoint a committee of competent experts to review the petition or proposal and to make a report and recommendations thereon. Each such advisory committee shall be composed of experts, qualified in the subject matter of the petition and of adequately diversified professional background selected by the National Academy of Sciences and shall include one or more representatives from land-grant colleges. The size of the committee shall be determined by the Secretary. Members of an advisory committee shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Secretary shall by rules and regulations prescribe, for time actually spent in the work of the committee, and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The members shall not be subject to any other provisions of law regarding the appointment and compensation of employees of the United States. The Secretary shall furnish the committee with adequate clerical and other assistance, and shall by rules and regulations prescribe the procedure to be followed by the committee.

"(h) A person who has filed a petition or who has requested the referral of a proposal to an advisory committee in accordance with the provisions of this section, as well as representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall have the right to consult with any advisory committee provided for in subsection (g) in connection with the petition or proposal.

"(i) (1) In a case of actual controversy as to the validity of any order under subsection (d) (5), (e), or (1) any person who will be adversely affected by such order may obtain judicial review by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within 60 days after the entry of such order, a petition praying that the order be set aside in whole or in part.

"(2) In the case of a petition with respect to an order under subsection (d) (5) or (e), a copy of the petition shall be forthwith served upon the Secretary, or upon any officer designated by him for that purpose, and

thereupon the Secretary shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his order. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the order complained of in whole or in part. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole, including any report and recommendation of an advisory committee.

"(3) In the case of a petition with respect to an order under subsection (1), a copy of the petition shall be forthwith served upon the Secretary of Agriculture, or upon any officer designated by him for that purpose, and thereupon the Secretary shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his order. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the order complained of in whole or in part. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole.

"(4) If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper, if such evidence is material and there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceedings below. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, may modify his findings as to the facts and order by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and shall file with the court such modified findings and order.

"(5) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any order under this section shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court to the contrary, operate as a stay of an order. The courts shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this section.

"(j) The Secretary may, upon the request of any person who has obtained an experimental permit for a pesticide chemical under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act or upon his own initiative, establish a temporary tolerance for the pesticide chemical for the uses covered by the permit whenever in his judgment such action is deemed necessary to protect the public health, or may temporarily exempt such pesticide chemical from a tolerance. In establishing such a tolerance, the Secretary shall give due regard to the necessity for experimental work in developing an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply and to the limited hazard to the public health involved in such work when conducted in accordance with applicable regulations under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

"(k) Regulations affecting pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities which are promulgated under the authority of section 406 (a) upon the basis of public hearings instituted before January 1, 1953, in accordance with section 701 (e), shall be deemed to be regulations under this section and shall be subject to amendment or repeal as provided in subsection (m).

"(l) The Secretary of Agriculture, upon request of any person who has registered, or who has submitted an application for the registration of, an economic poison under

the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and whose request is accompanied by a copy of a petition filed by such person under subsection (d) (1) with respect to a pesticide chemical which constitutes, or is an ingredient of, such economic poison, shall, within 30 days or within 60 days if, upon notice prior to the termination of such 30 days the Secretary deems it necessary to postpone action for such period, on the basis of data before him, either—

"(1) certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that such pesticide chemical is useful for the purpose for which a tolerance or exemption is sought; or

"(2) notify the person requesting the certification of his proposal to certify that the pesticide chemical does not appear to be useful for the purpose for which a tolerance or exemption is sought, or appears to be useful for only some of the purposes for which a tolerance or exemption is sought.

In the event that the Secretary of Agriculture takes the action described in clause (2) of the preceding sentence, the person requesting the certification, within 1 week after receiving the proposed certification, may either (A) request the Secretary of Agriculture to certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the basis of the proposed certification; (B) request a hearing on the proposed certification or the parts thereof objected to; or (C) request both such certification and such hearing. If no such action is taken, the Secretary may by order make the certification as proposed. In the event that the action described in clause (A) or (C) is taken, the Secretary shall by order make the certification as proposed with respect to such parts thereof as are requested. In the event a hearing is requested, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide opportunity for a prompt hearing. The certification of the Secretary of Agriculture as the result of such hearing shall be made by order and shall be based only on substantial evidence of record at the hearing and shall set forth detailed findings of fact. In no event shall the time elapsing between the making of a request for a certification under this subsection and final certification by the Secretary of Agriculture exceed 160 days. The Secretary shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with any certification of usefulness under this subsection an opinion, based on the data before him, whether the tolerance or exemption proposed by the petitioner reasonably reflects the amount of residue likely to result when the pesticide chemical is used in the manner proposed for the purpose for which the certification is made. The Secretary of Agriculture, after due notice and opportunity for public hearing, is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this subsection.

"(m) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe by regulations the procedure by which regulations under this section may be amended or repealed, and such procedure shall conform to the procedure provided in this section for the promulgation of regulations establishing tolerances, including the appointment of advisory committees and the procedure for referring petitions to such committees.

"(n) The provisions of section 303 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the furnishing of guarantees shall be applicable to raw agricultural commodities covered by this section."

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purpose and administration of this act.

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment, except that with respect to pesticide chemicals for which tolerances or exemptions have not been established under section 408 of the Federal Food,

Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the amendment to section 402 (a) of such act made by section 2 of this act shall not be effective—

(1) for the period of 1 year following the date of the enactment of this act; or

(2) for such additional period following such period of 1 year, but not extending beyond 2 years after the date of the enactment of this act, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe on the basis of a finding that conditions exist which necessitate the prescribing of such additional period.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 10, strike out "(1)" and insert "(1)."

Page 5, line 8, after "from", insert "the requirement of."

Page 6, line 7, strike out "(1)" and insert "(1)."

Page 6, line 9, after "Secretary", insert "of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Page 6, line 20, strike out "event" and insert "events."

Page 6, line 25, strike out "(1)" and insert "(1)."

Page 7, line 2, after "or", insert "in the event"; and, in lines 3 and 4, after "Secretary," insert "of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Page 10, line 1, strike out "person," and insert "person."

Page 11, line 3, strike out "or" and insert "of."

Page 12, line 20, strike out "(1)" and insert "(1)."

Page 13, line 17, strike out "(1)" and insert "(1)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH QUARANTINE STATION AT MARCUS HOOK, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6421) to authorize the exchange upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, an identical bill has passed the Senate, S. 2405. I ask unanimous consent that this Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act, the Administrator of General Services, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is hereby authorized, on behalf of the United States, to exchange with the Sun Oil Co., upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator may determine to be in the public interest, the lands and buildings comprising the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station (including land and buildings, a wharf, approaches, roadways, and other improvements incidental thereto, to be constructed in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Administrator) to be provided by the

Sun Oil Co. upon a suitable site in the Philadelphia port area.

SEC. 2. The exchange authorized by the first section of this act shall not be made unless the Administrator of General Services determines (1) that the value to the United States of the property to be conveyed to it is equal to or in excess of the market value of the property to be conveyed by the United States, or (2) that the United States is to receive from the Sun Oil Co., upon conveyance of the properties to be exchanged, a sum of money equal to the amount by which the market value of the property to be conveyed by the United States exceeds the value to the United States of the property to be conveyed to the United States. Any money received by the United States in connection with the exchange shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6421) was laid on the table.

FEDERAL LAND BANK PURCHASES OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION ASSETS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6711) to further amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will some member of the committee or the sponsor of the bill give a short explanation of this proposed legislation?

Mr. HOPE. This bill provides that the remainder of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation loans may be sold in bulk to each of the 12 Federal land banks which cover the territory in which these loans now exist.

I may say in explanation of why this situation becomes important that back in the early thirties the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was set up to make supplemental loans, in most cases to Federal land banks loans. That was back in the days of the depression. A very large number of loans were made by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Some of them were direct loans and some of them were supplemental loans to Federal land bank loans. In the meantime, most of those loans have been retired. There are only approximately 19,000 as I recall, that are left at this time. They are installment loans, amortized loans. They are paid down to where the average first mortgage is now only \$564, and the average size of the second loan is \$689.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Actually these loans are so small that in the case of at least one of the Federal land banks it is costing more to service them than the amount of interest received.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. That will be true in every one of the Federal land banks within the next few years, because as the loans reach that small point the service cost is more than the amount the loans bring in. The purpose of this legislation is to let the land banks, which carry on those operations anyhow, service them as their own loans, because this would require the land bank to pay the appraised value of them anyhow. It is just a matter of picking up these odds and ends that have developed over a period of years and that are still in the hands of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which was created to carry mortgages during the depression. The purpose is to get those odds and ends in the hands of a real operating agency, because the Federal land banks are going to continue to operate but the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is not making any new loans. That is the whole purpose, just to simplify the operation of these things.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. The Federal land banks are now serving them under a contract with the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. The cost in at least one land bank district, as the gentleman from Texas has said, exceeds the returns that come in. If the Federal land banks are willing to take these loans over, and I understand they are, and handle them as they are, I think it would be a better arrangement all the way around. The Federal Government is fully protected. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation has more than paid out. It has returned every cent the Government put up and in addition has paid dividends in a large amount.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman state whether or not this bill was reported out by a unanimous vote?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is true. It was very carefully considered and was reported unanimously.

Mr. ASPINALL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 781), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Twentieth. Without regard to any limitations or restrictions of this act, to purchase all assets, except cash, accounts receivable, and reserved mineral interests, held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the farm credit district in which said bank is situated and to assume the liabilities of said Corporation for future payment funds of borrowers and trust accounts applicable to said assets. The purchase price of notes and mortgages, purchase money mortgages, and real estate sales contracts shall be equal to the total of the unpaid balances on such items and accrued interest thereon at the date of purchase, less the total of the liabilities of the Corporation being assumed by the bank as herein provided. The purchase price of real estate, sheriff's certificates, loans called for foreclosure, loans in suspense, judgments, and any other assets eligible for purchase under this paragraph but not specifically identified herein shall be equal to the fair market value of the assets as determined by agreement. The total consideration for the purchase shall be payable

over a period of not more than 10 years from the date of purchase, and upon such terms as shall be agreed upon through negotiation with the board of directors of the Corporation."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHOSHONE RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6988) to amend an act approved December 15, 1944, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in Powell townsite, Wyoming, Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the University of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved December 15, 1944, Public Law 487, 78th Congress, chapter 590, second session, is hereby amended to terminate the trust imposed on the land caused to be conveyed by patent by the Secretary of the Interior to the University of Wyoming, under and by virtue of the authority of said act, without affecting the reservation to the United States of all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits within said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, as in said act provided, by striking out the following: "in trust for use as an agricultural experiment station;"

Sec. 2. Section 2 of said act of December 15, 1944, Public Law 487, 78th Congress, chapter 590, second session, to accomplish the purposes aforesaid, is also amended by striking out the whole thereof.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver to the University of Wyoming any documentary evidence which he may determine to be necessary to carry out the intent of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIFORMED SERVICES CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT OF 1953

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8539) to extend the period of election under the Uniformed Services Contingency Act of 1953 for certain members of the uniformed services.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 is amended by deleting in the third sentence the words "one hundred and eighty days" and substitute thereof the words "one year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENTING OF PLANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5420) to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants,

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 161, title 35, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 161. Patents for plants: Whoever invents or discovers and asexually reproduces any distinct and new variety of plant, including cultivated sports, mutants, hybrids, and newly found seedlings, other than a tuber-propagated plant or wild variety found in an uncultivated state, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

"The provisions of this title relating to patents for inventions shall apply to patents for plants, except as otherwise provided."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "tuber-propagated" and insert "tuberpropagated."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "wild variety" and insert in lieu thereof "a plant."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

VESTING TITLE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL LANDS IN STATES

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 308, the bill (H. R. 7110) to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act confirming in States and Territories title to lands granted by the United States in the aid of common or public schools," approved January 25, 1927, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 870), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding subsection (c), the fact that there is outstanding on any numbered mineral section at the time of its survey a lease or leases entered into by the United States, or an application therefor, shall not prevent the grant of such numbered mineral section to the State concerned as provided in this act.

"(2) Any numbered mineral section which has been surveyed prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection, and which has not been granted to the State concerned solely by reason of the fact that there was outstanding on it at the time of the survey a lease or leases entered into by the United States, or an application therefor, is hereby granted by the United States to such State under this section as if it had not been so leased; and the State shall succeed to the position of the United States as lessor under such lease or leases.

"(3) Any numbered mineral section which is surveyed on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and on which there is outstanding at the time of such survey a lease or leases entered into by the United States, shall (unless excluded from

the provisions of this section by subsection (c) for a reason other than the existence of an outstanding lease) be granted to the State concerned immediately upon completion of such survey; and the State shall succeed to the position of the United States as lessor under such lease or leases.

"(4) The Secretary of the Interior shall, upon application by a State, issue patents to the State for the lands granted by this act, in accordance with the act of June 12, 1934 (48 Stat. 1185, 43 U. S. C., sec. 871a). Such patent shall include a statement that the State succeeded to the position of the United States as lessor at the time the title vested in the State."

Sec. 2. Subsection (c) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "That" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Except as provided in subsection (d)."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 8, add the following:

"(5) Where, at the time royalties accrue, the lands or deposits covered by a single lease are owned in part by the State and in part by the United States, the royalties shall be allocated between them in proportion to the acreage in said lease owned by each."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER M. PIERCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I tell the Congress of the passing on March 27 of my distinguished and worthy predecessor in the Congress, Hon. Walter M. Pierce. He represented the Second District of Oregon for 10 years from the 73d through the 77th Congress. I have heard many fine tributes paid to him by Members of the Congress who served with him, and it is an honor for me to speak of him and the contribution he made.

I share the grief of his devoted family. He leaves his widow, Mrs. Cornelia Marvin Pierce, and four daughters, Mrs. Helen Wilson, of Mountain Lakes, N. J.; Mrs. Harold Hall and Mrs. R. G. Whitten, of Portland; and Mrs. George Stadelman, of The Dalles, Ore. I have had the privilege of being acquainted with only one of his daughters, Mrs. Stadelman, who is a very fine citizen of The Dalles. I also know her husband, my good friend Mr. George Stadelman, who is one of the leading citizens of Wasco County. I likewise have the honor to know Mrs. Pierce, who worked closely with her husband and was of inestimable value to him in his work and his service in the Congress.

Congressman Pierce was born in Illinois the same year that Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated as President and he loved Lincoln stories and history. He was a deep student of history and was one of the great orators of the House when he was a Member.

In 1883 he moved to Oregon, where he taught school and served as county school superintendent and county clerk. In 1896 he received a law degree from

Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. He practiced law for 10 years, operated livestock and wheat farms, engaged in banking and the power and light business, was in the Oregon State Senate 2 terms, and was the honored Governor of Oregon from 1923-27. I feel that his memory will remain a deep and important part of Oregon.

The life of Walter Marcus Pierce was one of high purpose and earnestness, and today on the floor of this Congress where he has so often stood I pay honor to him, a loyal Oregonian, a good American and a true gentleman.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I served in the House with Governor Pierce and I want to add my tribute to his memory.

I came to the Congress in the 76th Congress at the time our late colleague was a Member of the House. I had the opportunity of serving with him for many years. I found him very valuable to me, although we sat on opposite sides of the aisle, when I came here, inexperienced in this body. He was always helpful and always a friend. As the gentleman from Oregon has said, he occupied a unique place in the State of Oregon. He occupied many of the most important official positions that the State of Oregon could give to any citizen. He was Governor of our State. He represented the State in this body for many years, and he held many other public offices in the State of Oregon. Although he belonged to the Democratic faith, Oregon at that time was strongly Republican. Notwithstanding that, he received a large vote in every election in which he was a candidate.

I am glad to join with my colleague from Oregon in paying this tribute to our late departed friend.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks three appraisals of the life and work of our late colleague which appeared in the Oregon press at the time of his death:

[From the Portland Oregonian of March 28, 1954]

EX-GOVERNOR PIERCE DIES

SALEM.—Walter M. Pierce, Governor of Oregon from 1923 to 1927, died Saturday night at his home near Eola. He was 92.

Death came at 8:40 p. m. He had been bedfast the past year, and took a turn for the worse last week.

Mr. Pierce's political career started in 1886 with his election as Umatilla County school superintendent and ended 56 years later when, at the age of 81, he barely won the Democratic nomination to succeed himself in Congress. He lost in the general election to Lowell Stockman, Pendleton rancher.

A devoted Democrat and champion of liberal causes, Mr. Pierce often quarreled with his own party leaders. He was a powerful influence in the public power movement and waged a lifelong war against liquor.

In his 90th birthday letter to his family, he wrote: "I was a New Dealer, and proud of it."

Mr. Pierce was a famous breeder of Hereford cattle, and when elected governor his ranch near La Grande contained 13,000 acres. He prided himself as being a farmer-governor.

[From the Portland Oregonian of March 28, 1954]

LIBERAL CAUSES SUPPORTED BY EX-GOVERNOR PIERCE

Ex-Gov. Walter M. Pierce, who died at his country home near Eola in Polk County Saturday night, devoted his life to politics and maintained an active political interest until shortly before his death at 92.

Born at Morris, Ill., May 30, 1861, he came to Oregon in 1883, and after living in Portland a short time moved to Pendleton. He entered politics there, and soon became a leader in Democrat Party circles.

His political life was spent in Umatilla and Union Counties, where he had a big ranch. It was from there he rose to serve Oregon as Democratic governor and Congressman in a State generally Republican.

LIBERAL CAUSES SUPPORTED

A campaigner for liberal causes, Mr. Pierce championed public power and was a strong factor in the initiative and referendum movement. He fought for State aid for school districts, having United States Senators elected by the people, adoption of State income and gasoline taxes, guarding of civil liberties, Federal aid for farmers, irrigation development, and forest conservation.

A lifelong prohibitionist, he first entered the political arena at Milton in the middle 1880's, when he waged a successful campaign to throw liquor out of Milton.

His defeat for his congressional seat in 1942 he blamed on the fact he opposed creating the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. Pierce first met Franklin D. Roosevelt when the latter was Assistant Secretary of the Navy and they were friends until the late President died.

Mr. Pierce was defeated a number of times in his campaigns for office. Often he ran for public office simply because no other Democrat could be persuaded to run.

He was never known to hold bitter feeling toward his opponents. His keen sense of humor was well known, and he liked to remind his staunch Democrat friends that the closest tree to his Eola home was a black Republican cherry.

PIERCE ELECTOR FOR BRYAN

His public service included 2 terms in the State senate, 1902-06 and 1916-20; Democratic National Committeeman; member of the board of regents of Oregon State College for 22 years, and presidential elector for William Jennings Bryan.

After having been school superintendent in Umatilla County for 4 years, Mr. Pierce was elected county clerk in 1900. He studied law, received his formal law degree from Northwestern University in 1896, and was admitted to practice in Oregon. He practiced in Pendleton until 1905, when he moved to his large ranch in Union County.

He became a recognized authority on taxation, and was appointed by Gov. Ben W. Olcott to study the State's entire tax setup. He was among the first to seek hard-surfaced highways in Oregon, and was largely responsible for enactment of the 1919 soldiers' education bill.

Mr. Pierce represented Morrow, Umatilla, and Union Counties as State senator from 1902 to 1906, but was defeated in his try for reelection. He tried for the United States Senate in 1912, but was beaten. In 1916 he won another 4 years in the State senate, but was defeated for reelection by 11 votes.

REELECTION BID FAILS

He failed in his bid for reelection as governor in 1926, and failed 2 years later when he tried for Congress. He didn't run in 1930, but started his 10 years in Washington, D. C., with his election in 1932. He was reelected four times, all with big margins. When he entered Congress at the age of 72, he was the oldest Member sworn in up to that time.

His political career ended with the 1942 campaign, but he was a presidential elector in 1944, casting his vote for the fourth term for Roosevelt.

LAST YEARS AT EOLA

Mr. Pierce in 1887 married Clara R. Rudio. She died in 1890 after the birth of a daughter, Clara. The daughter died 15 years ago.

In 1893 Mr. Pierce married his first wife's sister, Laura. Five children were born to that union, including a son, Loyd, who died in 1942. The second Mrs. Pierce died while her husband was governor.

On the last day of 1928, Mr. Pierce married Cornelia Marvin, Oregon's first State librarian, who survives him.

Since retiring from the office of Representative in Congress, Mr. and Mrs. Pierce have lived almost continuously on a country place near Eola in Polk County.

Surviving are the widow and four daughters, Mrs. George Stadelman, The Dalles; Mrs. Harold Hall and Mrs. Eugene Whitten, Portland; and Mrs. Helen Wilson, New York City, and a brother, Frank Pierce, Fairbanks, Calif.

Mr. Pierce was a member of the Masonic and Odd Fellows lodges.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of March 28, 1954]

"GRAND OLD MAN OF STATE DEMOS" TITLE GAINED BY WALTER PIERCE

SALEM, March 27.—Walter Marcus Pierce, grand old man of State Democratic politics who governed Oregon when he was in his sixties and represented the Second District in Congress until after his 81st birthday, died tonight. He was 92.

In a valedictory speech in the House of Representatives on November 27, 1942, he gave this summary of his political career:

"I served 4 years as school superintendent of Umatilla County, 4 years as clerk of the same county. I served in the Oregon Senate 4 years as joint senator from Umatilla, Union, and Morrow Counties, and another 4 years as joint Senator from Union and Walwala Counties.

"I served as Governor of Oregon 4 years, from 1923 to 1927, and am now completing my 10th year in the Congress, from 1933 to 1943—momentous years.

"Sixty years of residence in Oregon—30 of them in public office. During practically all that time there was an adverse registered political majority.

"I have won 13 major political campaigns, lost 7. I am the only Democrat who has ever represented the Second District in the Congress."

As Governor, Pierce was a champion of reduced taxes on real estate and an advocate of a State income tax. With his support, an income tax measure was passed by a narrow margin at a referendum election in 1923. The tax was repealed at another election the next year.

In his first year in office opponents circulated petitions for his recall, but the petitions were not filed.

In Congress, Pierce worked for agriculture and forestry measures. At various times he also supported public ownership of utilities, dissemination of birth-control information, restriction of Supreme Court powers over economic legislation, and a 7½-percent tax on oleomargarine.

In eastern Oregon, in the intervals of his early political career, he practiced law and accumulated ranchland. At one time he was one of Oregon's chief cattle breeders and raisers.

He considered himself a champion of farmers' and cattlemen's interests. Campaigning for the governorship, he declared, "There will never be found any contrivance or substitute for the porterhouse steak, which will forever retain its position of preminship at the dinner table for civilized man."

As recently as 1946 Pierce was mentioned as a possible candidate for governor. But except for serving as presidential elector in 1944, he observed the declaration he made in his valedictory to Congress.

"I am well aware of the fact," he said on that occasion, "that old Father Time has a rendezvous with me which will prevent my comeback into the political arena."

Pierce finished dictating his memoirs of more than a half century of public life before his death.

His wife, Cornelia Marvin Pierce, said she is editing them but has not arranged for their publication. The memoirs were a principal interest of Pierce's last years.

After his enforced retirement from Congress in 1943, he continued to follow closely the affairs of the Grange and Farmers Union.

He was born in a bottomland farm near Morris, Ill., on May 30, 1861, and prided himself on being a farmer as well as a legislator who understood farmers' problems. At his death, however, he no longer directly managed any land.

His holdings in ranch land had been reduced by sale or gift to his children to 1,120 acres in Union County. This acreage is farmed by tenants.

Pierce's formal education, except for law study after he reached maturity, was limited. Nevertheless, in the Midwest, where he remained until after his 21st birthday, he taught school in the winters. In the summers he farmed.

Before coming to Umatilla County in 1883 he lived for a year in Colorado, working as a muleskinner and cowpuncher. At Milton soon after his arrival in Oregon he got a job as a ranch hand at \$30 a month. In the winter, as in Illinois, he taught school.

In 1888 he was elected to his first public office—school superintendent of Umatilla County. Two years later he was elected county clerk. He was reelected in 1892.

Meanwhile he had been studying law. After his work as county clerk he went to Northwestern University where he received a law degree in 1896.

He returned to Oregon and practiced law in Pendleton for 8 years.

His activities also included speculation in land and promotion of the Hot Lake sanitarium. He owned and operated the electric system at La Grande for several years.

In 1902 he was elected State senator. A decade later he made his first bid for a national office—United States Senator. He lost, and he lost again, to Ben Olcott, when he ran for governor in 1918.

Four years later he beat Olcott and became governor. In those years the Ku Klux Klan was a political power in the State and Olcott, in his reelection campaign, openly opposed the Klan.

Pierce's campaign for reelection was unsuccessful. I. L. Patterson, a Republican, beat him.

His first wife, Clara R. Rudlo, whom he married in 1887, bore him two children and died in 1890. Both children also are dead. In 1893 Pierce married his first wife's sister, Laura M. Rudlo. To that marriage five children, four now living, were born. Those surviving him are Mrs. Harold Hall and Mrs. Eugene Whitten, both of Portland; Mrs. George Stadelman, The Dalles, and Mrs. E. Ray Wilson, Mountain Lakes, N. J.

Pierce's only son, Lloyd, died in 1942. His eldest daughter, Clara, died in 1937.

The second Mrs. Pierce died while her husband was governor.

His present wife, whom he married in 1923, was State librarian. She served as his secretary while he was in Congress.

Mr. COON. I thank the gentleman.
Mr. NORBALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague in also paying tribute to the late Walter Pierce.

Mr. Pierce probably had the longest and most active political career of anyone in the State of Oregon. I first knew him when he was a State senator and was serving with my father in that body. While the two men were of opposing political parties they nevertheless were very good and close friends.

My last visit with Mr. Pierce was in 1946, shortly after I had been elected to Congress and I recall how alert and physically active he was then, despite his advanced years. He had an excellent grasp of the issues of the day and was very interested in the several matters which we discussed.

His political career started about the time that I was born and continued for more than 40 years. He was a Member of this body for the last 10 years of his career and many Members present here today knew, liked, and respected him.

For many years to come his name will loom large in the history of our State.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of considerable sadness that I read in the papers the other day of the passing of Walter Pierce, a man who served in this body some 10 years.

It was not my good fortune to serve in the House at the same time that Governor Pierce served. He retired from this body the year before I came. However, it was my privilege to have been personally acquainted with both Walter Pierce and with his wife, Cornelia Marvin Pierce.

Governor Pierce was a fine public servant, in my opinion, although he served as a member of the opposite party. We on the Republican side always respected Walter Pierce and he served with honor and distinction in many high public offices, including the governorship of the State of Oregon.

He lived a long and full life, passing at the age of 92. He gave much of himself to the service of his fellow man.

I am glad to join the gentleman from eastern Oregon in paying this tribute on the floor of the House to our departed friend, Walter Pierce.

Mr. COON. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COON. I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the life and character of the late Honorable Walter M. Pierce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the consideration of H. R. 6318, which

bill was passed over, and the colloquy which took place, in which I participated, and some observations I made in connection with a possible amendment, that there be included a comparison which the Library of Congress has prepared for me between Public Law 101 of the 77th Congress and H. R. 6318 of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in the program for this week outlined by the majority leader on Friday last, that business in order on Monday, today, is the calling of the Consent Calendar and general debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill. Members have been alerted that there would be nothing today but general debate on this bill following the Consent Calendar. This is the notice I gave to Members by which to govern themselves.

I am not interposing any objection if the leadership on the gentleman's side desires a 2-hour limitation, but I think we should have proper concern and regard for Members on both sides who have governed themselves by the notices sent out on the program for today.

I respectfully call this matter to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa—and I am happy to see him back; we all are. I would not object to 2 hours' limitation on general debate if there is no rollcall on the bill or with the understanding that if there is any rollcall it would go over until tomorrow. I simply want to protect the rights of the Members in accordance with the announcement of the program which I sent to the Democratic Members and which the Republican whip sent to the Republican Members.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is no intention to complete the bill today. I understand that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], floor leader on our side, made the announcement last Friday that we would take up this bill today and have general debate of 2 hours, after which time the reading of the bill would be carried over until tomorrow. I had nothing to do with the arrangement; nevertheless, I am agreeable to it; so that is the way it will be, I may say to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. The gentleman's announcement to his colleagues on his side of

the aisle is appreciated and it will be respected.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has clarified the matter to my complete satisfaction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

Abbt	Fine	Morrison
Addonizio	Fino	Moulder
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Multer
Allen, Ill.	Friedel	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barden	Gamble	Osmer
Barrett	Garmatz	Patten
Battle	Gary	Patterson
Bender	Granahan	Philbin
Bentley	Green	Phillips
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Boggs	Hart	Radwan
Bolton,	Hays, Ark.	Reed, Ill.
Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Rhodes, Pa.
Bosch	Heller	Richards
Boykin	Herlong	Riehlman
Byrneson	Hinshaw	Rivers
Busbey	Hoffman, Ill.	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Holtzman	Rodino
Canfield	Horan	Roosevelt
Carlyle	Hosmer	Scott
Carrigg	Jarman	Sheppard
Celler	Javits	Sieminski
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Sutton
Chilperfield	Kearney	Taylor
Chudoff	King, Pa.	Thompson, La.
Condon	Klein	Tuck
Cooley	Kluczynski	Utt
Cotton	Krueger	Velde
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Wainwright
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Warburton
Dawson, Ill.	Lyle	Weichel
Dingell	McIntire	Widnall
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Durham	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. J.
Fallon	Morgan	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8680.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8680, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to thank God for sparing my life and the

life of every Member and everyone who was on this floor on March 1 when the terrible shooting incident occurred. I want to thank everyone who was so kind to me while I was in the hospital and since I have been at home under the care of my good wife. Especially do I want to thank our Chaplain, Reverend Braskamp, who came to the hospital at regular intervals to see me and the other four Members who were wounded. He would always offer a prayer of thanksgiving to Almighty God for sparing our lives and for the miracle which took place on that day when not a single Member of this Congress or any clerk or page boy received fatal injury.

I want to thank the hundreds and thousands of people who sent nice messages of encouragement to me, as I know all the other four Members wish to do; for the many beautiful bouquets which were sent to me. They numbered approximately 100.

I want to thank the people in my district who sent me words of encouragement. I have replied to each one of them, as well as to all other persons who sent me letters and messages, not only in America but from many nations of the world, where I had been last fall on a trip around the world.

I want to thank the people of Puerto Rico, the school children who wrote letters by the thousand asking us not to judge all the people of Puerto Rico by the folks who did this terrible deed. I want to thank the Governor of Puerto Rico for coming to the United States to see each one of us in the hospital; and his good wife and daughters who came to see and visit with our wives. It was a wonderful gesture of friendship and big-heartedness. Certainly no one can blame the good people of Puerto Rico. I visited there several years ago, and I was impressed by the fine treatment that was given to us at that time. I know the people of Puerto Rico are fine people, generally speaking, and certainly not one of the Members who was wounded judges the people of Puerto Rico by what happened in this House on March 1.

All in all, I want to thank God for being able to stand here on the floor of this House of Representatives of the United States of America and to see the expression of friendship and good fellowship that my colleagues have demonstrated here today.

We live in a great Nation. I have had over 30 days now to think through, and to think seriously and deeply about, the great responsibility which we in this Congress have on our shoulders.

I have come to a number of conclusions about many of the issues which confront this Congress. I shall, of course, not attempt at this time to make a statement on those issues. I can only hope and pray, as I know each one of you does, that this Congress, and the President, and everyone in America who has something to do with the formation of our policies will find the right answers and that we may come out of this era bigger, and finer, and better than ever before; that the world will know that we Americans have only one purpose in mind, and that is to do the right thing by all of the peoples of the world so that

we may again have peace and good will among men.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall explain a few things which I think are pertinent regarding this bill presented by the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with Interior Department appropriations. First, I think it is well that I read a statement which you will see in the report beginning on page 1 under the title "Basic Considerations":

In its consideration of the budget request the committee has been mindful of the fact that in the long-range view much larger sums than those contemplated in either the budget or the bill could be expended profitably for the development and conservation of our natural resources. Both the lower budget estimates for fiscal year 1955 and the committee reductions reflect the fact that some projects are nearing completion. However, these lower figures are dictated in large measure by the urgent need for conserving dollars to improve the present Federal Government fiscal position. The reductions made by the committee are aimed principally at activities where cuts can be absorbed by more efficient operation, where private enterprise or local interests can perform the function, or where delay will not jeopardize achievement of the ultimate objective.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire report be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. JENSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1955.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The bill provides regular annual appropriations for all of the various activities under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, The Virgin Islands Corporation, and the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review. The budget estimates of appropriations for the items provided for in the bill may be found in the 1955 budget document, pages 708 through 807 and page 117.

A tabulation is presented at the end of this report detailing appropriations in the bill for 1955, the budget estimates for 1955, the amounts appropriated for 1954, and a comparison of the amounts recommended in the bill with the appropriations for 1954 and the estimates for 1955. A summary of the totals follows:

The budget estimates for 1955	
total.....	\$422, 118, 430
The committee recommends in	
the accompanying bill.....	363, 360, 989
This is a reduction under the	
budget estimates of.....	58, 757, 441
And a reduction under 1954	
appropriations of.....	71, 270, 061

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

In its consideration of the budget request the committee has been mindful of the fact that in the long-range view much larger sums than those contemplated in either the budget or the bill could be expended profitably for the development and conservation of our natural resources. Both the lower budget estimates for fiscal year 1955 and the committee reductions reflect the fact that some projects are nearing completion. How-

ever, these lower figures are dictated in large measure by the urgent need for conserving dollars to improve the present Federal Government fiscal position. The reductions made by the committee are aimed principally at activities where cuts can be absorbed by more efficient operation, where private enterprise or local interests can perform the function, or where delay will not jeopardize achievement of the ultimate objective.

The budget contemplated one change which would have affected a number of appropriation items throughout the bill. Heretofore all funds to be used for Missouri River Basin surveys and investigations were appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation under the "Construction and rehabilitation" heading. Some of these funds were for transfer to other bureaus of the Department, equipped to do the specialized work required. In this manner, the full amount of the appropriation going into the Missouri River Basin program could be readily identified. The budget proposed to have the funds to be expended by other bureaus appropriated directly to those bureaus, and to the "General investigations" item in the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation. The committee does not intend to have the amounts appropriated for this program obscured and has made the proper adjustments throughout the bill to put the full amount allowed for the Missouri River Basin project back into the Bureau of Reclamation "Construction and rehabilitation" item so that the funds properly chargeable to each project in the total program can continue to be identified.

POWER RATES

In a number of instances power rates have been established and put into effect in past years without review by the Federal Power Commission. The language in the accompanying appropriation bill says specifically in several places that the funds are to be expended pursuant to the provisions of section V of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Section V of the Flood Control Act of 1944 includes the following: "Rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission."

There can be no doubt that the appropriations are available only in accordance with the expressed terms of section V and there can be no doubt that section V specifically and directly requires the approval of rates by the Federal Power Commission. The Department of the Interior has in the past ignored this provision of the law and made the most flimsy explanation of their reasons for having done so. The committee desires to point out that in the future it will regard any expenditure of appropriations on any other basis than strict compliance with section V, wherever it is applicable, as illegal expenditures. It should be clear that the Department cannot expend funds from appropriations in connection with the operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities or marketing electric power and energy under any contract, the rates in which should have been approved by the Federal Power Commission and have not been.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act

An appropriation of \$125,000 is recommended. This is \$25,000 below the amount available in 1954, and a reduction of the same amount below the budget estimate for 1955. Efficient use of personnel should permit continuation of an effective enforcement program.

Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration

The budget estimate is \$1,450,000. The committee has allowed \$1,228,000, a reduction of \$222,000. The reduction is to apply against the \$1,200,000 requested for the purchase of power and the payment of wheeling fees in connection with the Southeastern Power Administration contract with the

Virginia Electric and Power Co. The amount of \$978,000 is allowed for this purpose and should be sufficient to permit required electric service to all preference customers of the Government in a normal water year.

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

The committee recommends a direct appropriation of \$275,000 and a transfer of unobligated construction funds in the amount of \$775,000 making available a total of \$1,050,000 for the fiscal year 1955. This is a reduction of \$500,000 below the total of \$1,550,000 programed in the budget, and \$550,000 below the amount available during the current year.

The budget contemplated an unobligated balance of \$1,125,000 in previously appropriated construction funds, of which it was proposed to transfer to the operation and maintenance appropriation \$520,000, leaving a balance of \$605,000 for construction work in 1955. The amount allowed for this proposed construction program has been reduced to \$530,000 making an additional amount of \$75,000 available for transfer to the operation and maintenance appropriation. Reductions in the construction program consist of \$65,000 for the Carthage line and substation and \$10,000 for metering equipment. In addition an unobligated balance, estimated by the administration at \$130,000 at the time of the hearings, has been increased to \$180,000, which amount will also be available for transfer to the operation and maintenance appropriation.

The budget figure of \$350,000 for customer connections has been allowed in full.

Of the total amount provided, not to exceed \$550,000, is to be used for personal services. The recently completed survey report ordered by the Secretary and approved by him required a personnel reduction to 86 employees. The \$550,000 allowed for personal services will be adequate to pay the salaries of the 86 employees and provide some cushion for terminal leave in the reduction process. Included within the remaining amount of \$500,000 there are sufficient funds to pay wheeling charges for delivery of power to preference customers over both REA cooperative and private utility transmission system, and for purchase of firming energy from private utilities in the area, both in accordance with estimated schedules set out in the justifications.

Research in the utilization of saline water

An appropriation of \$255,000 has been allowed. This is a reduction of \$145,000 below the budget and the same amount below the current year appropriation. On the basis of testimony received the obligation rate of funds for this program has been lagging somewhat, so that the reduction will not seriously alter the general program level. The funds are used for stimulating and coordinating research to develop low-cost processes for converting saline water to fresh water in quantities sufficient for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses.

Oil and Gas Division

The budget estimate for this Division is \$300,000. The committee has allowed \$100,000, a reduction of \$200,000 below the budget estimate. Activities of this organization were consolidated with the work of the Petroleum Administration for Defense in 1951 and considerably expanded. While the function of putting together in one place all current data on petroleum and gas resources and their utilization is a continuing service to both government and industry, the high cost structure proposed in the budget appears to be out of all proportion to the workload involved or the needs for the service rendered. The appropriation allowed compares reasonably with the amounts which were appropriated for these activities prior to the time that they were consolidated with the Petroleum Administration for Defense.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Salaries and expenses

The budget estimate of \$21,200 has been allowed for the work of the Commission in providing the President, Congress, and the department heads with advice on matters of architecture, sculpture, painting, and other fine arts.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction

An appropriation of \$18,915,000 is recommended, a reduction of \$11,285,000 below the Budget estimate of \$30,200,000 and \$19,951,000 below the 1954 appropriation. The amounts to be used for personal services and travel are limited in the bill to \$6 million and \$500,000 respectively in order to proportion the amounts for these items to the reduced program.

While the reduction in this item is substantial, the committee has had expert engineering assistance in determining that the items deleted and the others which have been substantially reduced will not affect the ability of the Administration and the Northwest Power Pool to serve the expected loads during the fiscal year 1955. A principal concern of the committee with respect to the Bonneville construction program is that the unit costs on a number of its facilities appear to be considerably in excess of costs of private utilities for comparable work.

The following specific adjustments have been made in the construction program:

Facility	Budget program	Reduction	Program approved in bill
Chief Joseph-Snohomish	\$6,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000
Bellingham substation	324,000	324,000	-----
The Dalles area service	2,578,000	2,578,000	-----
Upper Willamette Valley service	4,428,000	428,000	4,000,000
Oregon City-Chemawa	101,000	101,000	-----
Coos Bay area service	1,183,000	1,183,000	(1)
McNary-Walla Walla	933,000	933,000	-----
McNary-La Grande	45,000	45,000	-----
General structures and improvements	810,000	400,000	410,000
Communication facilities	648,000	248,000	400,000
Tools and equipment	945,000	445,000	500,000
Preliminary engineering studies	100,000	100,000	-----
All other items	13,336,000	500,000	12,836,000
Total	31,431,000	9,285,000	22,146,000
Carryover balance from the Snohomish-Kitsap facility to be applied to the approved 1955 program	-----	-----	2,000,000
Other carryover funds and reimbursements to be applied to the approved program	-----	-----	1,231,000
Appropriated funds required	-----	-----	18,915,000

¹ Use of 1954 carryover funds is authorized.

The reduction applied to the Chief Joseph-Snohomish facility is made for the purpose of matching the transmission line construction schedule to the generator installation schedule at Chief Joseph Dam.

The need for the Dalles Service Area facilities is dependent upon the generator installation schedule at the project and the contemplated Harvey Machine Co. aluminum reduction plant load. A delay of 1 year is indicated by the generator installation schedule and there has been no supplemental budget request as yet for the transmission lines which would be required if the Harvey plant were to be built.

With respect to the Chief Joseph-Snohomish and Snohomish-Kitsap facilities, it is the committee's desire that the Administration confer further with the cities of Tacoma and Seattle, the Puget Sound Power & Light Co., and the Northwest Power Pool Conference members concerning the feasibility of bringing this line into the area

south of Seattle instead of to the north. Before construction of the line from Chief Joseph proceeds beyond the vicinity of Goldbar, the committee requires a full report on the outcome of this conference. It is understood that cooperation between the parties concerned in working out a plan of service for the Kitsap Peninsula can save considerable Federal expense.

With respect to the Coos Bay Area Service item, the committee was advised that a change of plans for servicing this area has been worked out with the California-Oregon Power Co. which result in an ultimate saving to the Federal Government. This revised plan as generally described in the hearings is approved. In contemplation of the new agreement none of the funds appropriated for this facility in the 1954 bill have been expended for actual construction of the originally planned Nickel Mountain-Norway transmission line. These funds, in the amount of approximately \$978,000, may be used in the fiscal year 1955 for beginning implementation of the new service plan.

Operation and maintenance

An appropriation of \$5 million is recommended. This is a reduction of \$1,600,000 below the budget estimate and \$1,004,000 below the 1954 appropriation. It is the committee's opinion that some of the activities being carried on with funds from this appropriation are not a proper or necessary function of the Bonneville Power Administration and that efficient and prudent use of personnel, equipment, and materials will permit an entirely adequate operation and maintenance program within the funds allowed.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Management of lands and resources

An appropriation of \$11,483,000 is recommended. This is the same amount as is available during the current year but a reduction of \$142,000 below the budget estimate of \$11,625,000. In making the reduction the committee has deleted \$200,000 programmed for land classification work in the Missouri River Basin. Money for this purpose is included in the construction and rehabilitation appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Of the amount allowed, \$220,000 is to be used for halogeton control by applying \$200,000 to actual control work and \$20,000 to the research program. In addition, \$100,000 is to be used specifically for pellet and/or conventional airplane seeding.

The committee is advised that there is a program contemplated for making use of surplus seed, acquired by the Department of Agriculture, for reseeding the public lands. This appears to be a desirable method of reducing the seed surplus. At the same time it will advance soil and moisture conservation through the development of vegetation to hold the soil instead of allowing it to wash into streams to silt up reservoirs and dissipate the tremendous investments which have been made in flood control and multipurpose dams. It is the committee's earnest desire that such an arrangement can be worked out between the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

The committee has on several occasions called attention to the ridiculous land withdrawals to provide 600-foot rights-of-way for Alaskan highways. This makes commercial or private development practically impossible in areas where it should be occurring. The Department is expected to correct this condition without delay.

Construction

An appropriation of \$2 million is recommended, a reduction of \$1 million below the budget estimate of \$3 million. These funds are used for the construction of access roads in the Oregon and California grant lands to permit the removal of timber now inaccessible. The appropriation is completely reimbursed to the general fund of the Treasury

out of timber receipts before distribution of such receipts, as required by law, is made to the counties in which the timber is located.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Health, education, and welfare services

The budget estimate for these activities is \$54,105,320. The committee has allowed \$52 million, a reduction of \$2,105,320 below the estimate but the same amount as is available during the current fiscal year. Of the amount allowed, not more than \$28,500,000 is to be used for personal services, but no reduction is to be made in the number of teachers, doctors, nurses, or other medical personnel required in the attendance of the sick.

The committee is convinced that more Indian children can be put into schools but that in certain areas of the Navajo reservation, schools must be taken to the children of nomad families to accomplish this objective. For this reason, and on the basis of past experience which has demonstrated the effectiveness of trailer school units, the Bureau is instructed to use \$460,000 of the funds available to purchase additional trailer units, and \$150,000 for employment of additional teachers.

Of the appropriation, \$91,250 is to be used to provide for 20 additional beds for Indian patients at the Methodist Hospital at Seward, Alaska, bringing the total number of beds to be used in that hospital to 75.

Resources management

The budget estimate of \$13,092,910 has been reduced to \$12,592,910. The reduction of \$500,000 is made up of \$150,000 for activities in the Missouri River Basin for which funds are provided in the "Construction and rehabilitation" item for the Bureau of Reclamation, and \$350,000 of the amount programmed for repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities. It would appear that volunteer assistance on the part of Indians themselves and the acceptance of greater responsibility by tribal organizations in care of physical facilities might be reasonably expected.

Of the amount allowed, \$100,000 is to be used for weed control and \$2,671,672, the same amount as is available this year, is to be used for the soil and moisture conservation program. Of this amount for soil and moisture conservation, \$100,000 is to be used for pellet and/or conventional airplane seeding. It is understood that a considerable amount of successful seeding by airplane has been accomplished on private lands in the Western States.

Construction

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,673,000, a reduction of \$2,663,000 below the budget estimate of \$10,336,000. The funds requested for the Kerr substation on the Flathead irrigation project, in the amount of \$75,000, and a total of \$2,588,000 programmed for school and hospital construction at Shiprock in the Navajo reservation have been disallowed. The reduction in the Navajo construction program is made as a result of testimony given the committee to the effect that the program as set out in the justifications is under review in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary's survey team which examined the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The funds allowed for personal services have been limited in the bill to \$3,500,000 in order to proportion this item to the reduced construction program.

General administrative expenses

The budget estimate for this item is \$3 million. The committee has allowed \$2,750,000, a reduction of \$250,000, which it is believed can be readily absorbed.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

The budget estimate for the activities under this head is \$6 million of which \$2,-

630,000 is for investigations in the Missouri River Basin. The balance of \$3,370,000 requested for the activities normally covered under the heading "General investigations," has been reduced to \$3 million, the same amount as is available during the current fiscal year. The \$2,630,000 for the Missouri River Basin investigations has been reduced to \$2 million and transferred to the "Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation.

The committee has been concerned for a number of years about the activities carried on by the Bureau under this heading. The programs which have been presented to the committee in the justifications give the impression that the Bureau's efforts are scattered in all directions in an effort to investigate every conceivable possibility for a project, and in many instances to go back to once abandoned projects in an effort to bring them into the realm of feasibility. The program laid out for fiscal year 1955 is no exception. In it there are a number of studies for development of projects which appear to be predominately municipal water supply and others that are primarily power developments. While the committee and the Congress have been liberal in providing funds for such projects where they are clearly justified, and do not duplicate existing facilities, taxpayer dollars will not be recommended for use where private or public utilities, or REA cooperatives have expressed a willingness to provide the service needed.

Investigations money is also included in the budget to determine the need for rehabilitation of existing projects. It is the committee's opinion that once a project has been completed and turned over to the water users that the Bureau should be willing to accept the fact that the beneficiaries can and should take the responsibility for care of their own project.

In spite of the fact that for years the bill has carried language which provides that States, municipalities, or other interests requesting investigations of any nature shall pay for half the cost of such investigations, only one of 142 different investigations programmed in the 1955 budget is supported in part by local interests. Obviously, little or no effort has been made to conform with the law in accepting overtures from local governmental sources and other interests in connection with the general investigations program.

Until such time as administrative controls are put on this program to tighten it up and orient it on what appears to be a reasonable number of potentially productive projects, appropriations for the general investigations activity will be carefully and critically scanned.

Construction and rehabilitation

There are several items with respect to this program to which the committee has particularly directed its attention. The first of these is the ratio of the costs for personal services to the total program costs. In the past years as high as 26 percent of the funds appropriated for the construction and rehabilitation program have been expended for the payment of personal services, and the amount programmed in the 1955 budget is approximately 23 percent of the total budget request. This is almost double the percentage allowed for engineering and supervision services in large scale engineering and construction activities of private enterprise. While it is recognized that such comparisons may not be entirely reliable because of certain circumstances unique to the reclamation program, including its research work and the necessary unit-by-unit development of the larger and more complex construction projects, it still appears that personal services costs are out of proportion to the magnitude of the total program. The committee considered a 15 percent limitation on such services, but in recognition of the difficulties of a rapid reduction to this figure, has not required that

it be accomplished during the fiscal year 1955. However, a limitation on the amount that may be spent for personal services has been placed in the bill to reduce the budget estimate by \$4,248,490, providing a net of \$24,000,000 or approximately 20 percent of the total program allowed in the bill.

Since water and power users are required to absorb a very large portion of personal services costs, it is neither fair nor good business practice to impose unnecessary engineering and supervision costs on their shoulders for any Federally financed project. There has been considerable criticism of the Bureau in the past brought about by overstaffing and an excessive number of field offices at all organizational levels. It is hoped that the beneficiaries of reclamation projects will recognize that the committee's effort to hold down personal services costs is in their interest.

The general practice of the Bureau to over-design structures and facilities has been observed on some of the projects by the committee members and has been reported by competent engineers. The committee is also aware of the tendency on the part of some architects and engineers to sacrifice practical considerations and taxpayers dollars by requiring specially manufactured equipment and nonstandard fabrication where standard items could be used. It is urged that the Commissioner interest himself in this particular problem in an effort to achieve economies in the program wherever possible. It should not be necessary for the committee or the Congress to have to direct attention to such items as this.

The Bureau has been operating, in cooperation with State Agricultural Extension Service interests, so-called development farms in some of the project areas. It is the committee's understanding that the purpose of such undertakings has been to find crops and farming methods best suited to the project lands. Agricultural development and demonstration work of this type should be left to the Department of Agriculture and to the various State agricultural services. Funds for such development farms programmed for the fiscal year 1955 are specifically disallowed.

The language previously in the bill referring to certifications as to irrigability of lands has been deleted since it is permanent legislation.

In its consideration of the construction program for 1955 the committee has increased the budget request for certain projects and has decreased it for others. Upward adjustments in the amounts programmed in the budget for some of the projects have been made in order to realize economies in overhead costs through early completion and in order to speed the time when the projects will be revenue producing through repayment contracts.

The appropriation of \$114,479,700 which has been allowed is \$7,358,300 below the budget estimate but only \$1,789,960 below the current-year program. The funds provided are distributed to the various projects and activities in amounts indicated in the following table:

Program summary—Construction and rehabilitation

Project or unit	Budget program	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	Program approved in the bill
Eklutna project, Alaska.....	\$4,612,000	—\$3,450,000	\$1,162,000
Gila project, Arizona.....	2,700,000	—	2,700,000
Yuma project, auxiliary division, Arizona.....	100,000	—	100,000
All-American Canal, Arizona-California.....	277,000	—230,000	47,000
Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona-California-Nevada.....	141,000	—	141,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada.....	1,206,000	—	1,206,000
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada.....	2,961,000	—1,561,000	1,400,000
Cachuma project, California.....	3,300,000	+2,700,000	6,000,000
Central Valley project, California.....	23,493,000	—2,493,000	21,000,000
Solano project, California.....	8,040,000	—2,040,000	6,000,000
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado.....	750,000	+500,000	1,250,000
Paonia project, Colorado.....	10,000	—10,000	—
Avondale irrigation project, Idaho.....	126,000	—	126,000
Dalton gardens irrigation project, Idaho.....	159,000	—	159,000
Minidoka project, north side pumping division, Idaho.....	1,925,000	—	1,925,000
Palisades project, Idaho.....	12,200,000	+800,000	13,000,000
Fort Peck project, Montana-North Dakota.....	545,000	—295,000	250,000
Carlsbad project, Alamogordo Dam spillway enlargement, New Mexico.....	300,000	—300,000	—
Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico.....	1,221,000	+500,000	1,721,000
Vermejo project, New Mexico.....	638,000	—	638,000
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas.....	169,000	—19,000	150,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California.....	1,200	—	1,200
Weber Basin project, Utah.....	7,900,000	—1,900,000	6,000,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington.....	8,818,000	+3,000,000	11,818,000
Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington.....	3,195,000	—	3,195,000
Yakima project, Roza division, Washington.....	125,000	—	125,000
Eden project, Wyoming.....	625,000	+175,000	800,000
Kendrick project, Wyoming.....	780,000	—	780,000
Riverton project, Wyoming.....	479,500	—79,500	400,000
Riverton project, payment to Shoshone and Arapahoe Indian Tribes, Wyoming.....	1,009,500	—	1,009,500
Missouri River Basin:			
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas.....	1,360,000	+640,000	2,000,000
Buford-Trenton, protection and improvement work, North Dakota.....	187,000	—	187,000
Canyon Ferry unit, Montana.....	155,000	—	155,000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas.....	35,000	—	35,000
Crow Creek unit, Montana.....	236,000	—	236,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.....	1,000,000	—	1,000,000
Heart Butte unit, North Dakota.....	150,000	—	150,000
Kirwin unit, Kansas.....	3,160,000	—	3,160,000
Lower Marias unit, Montana.....	6,100,000	—100,000	6,000,000
Missouri diversion unit, Montana.....	605,000	—605,000	—
Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota.....	2,433,000	—433,000	2,000,000
St. Francis unit, Colorado-Kansas.....	15,000	—	15,000
Shadell unit, South Dakota.....	18,000	—	18,000
Transmission division, various.....	13,005,000	—2,005,000	11,000,000
Webster unit, Kansas.....	5,980,000	—1,980,000	4,000,000
Drainage and minor completion program.....	212,000	—62,000	150,000
Missouri River basin investigation.....	2,630,000	—630,000	2,000,000
Other departmental agencies.....	2,240,000	—	2,240,000
Drainage and minor completion program.....	1,107,352	—307,352	800,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.....	1,546,303	—546,303	1,000,000
Subtotal, all foregoing items.....	129,980,855	—10,731,155	119,249,700
Estimated carryover balances available in 1955.....	—	—	—4,770,000
Appropriated funds required.....	—	—	114,479,700

Central Valley project: Funds for the Trinity division, amounting to \$99,000, have been specifically deleted in arriving at the reduction applied to this project. In its report on the 1954 bill, the committee enunciated the general policy that it would not consider appropriations for any project not authorized by legislation and for which construction funds have not been previously appropriated. In general agreement with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, this policy will apply to all projects costing in total \$5 million or more. The Trinity River division, estimated to cost ultimately \$181,612,000, is a project of the type that the committee had in mind when the policy was adopted, since it was added to the Central Valley project only by a finding of feasibility by the former Secretary of the Interior in the latter part of 1952.

The committee has also disallowed \$208,997 programmed for the Delta Fish Facilities, which are estimated to cost approximately \$4 million in total. While some device may be necessary for protecting fingerlings from the pumps at the Tracy Pumping Plant, the committee has had no evidence presented to it which would justify an ultimate expenditure in the magnitude indicated. The present program is to be thoroughly reviewed and all alternative methods of protection explored before additional appropriations will be considered. Sufficient funds are available for the remainder of the current fiscal year for this purpose.

The committee continues to be deeply concerned over the possibility of substantial reductions of power revenues which will accrue to the Central Valley project as a result of power sales contracts executed with public agencies in the project area, and the effect such contracts will have on the availability of project power to Federal defense establishments in the area. The committee urges the Secretary of the Interior to continue investigations and close scrutiny of such contracts and take such action as may be necessary to protect the Federal establishments, the water users, and the integrity of the project.

The committee of conference and this committee, in reporting on the Interior Department Appropriation bill for fiscal year 1954, last year directed the Secretary of the Interior to complete a study "to determine the savings in Federal funds and other advantages which could accrue to the project by transfer of the Folsom transmission line at full cost to the public utility serving the area and by the integration and wheeling of Folsom and Nimbus power through the regional transmission system at no additional cost to the United States under the power interchange and wheeling contracts executed after the line was authorized." Information that has recently come to the committee indicates that the results obtained by the studies made to date are inconclusive. The committee desires that these studies be diligently prosecuted and a report rendered thereon in order that the committee may make an appropriate recommendation to Congress on the matter at the earliest possible date.

All-American Canal, Coachella division: Previously appropriated funds available for use on the Coachella division of this project for construction of a highway crossing for the Mecca-Blythe highway across the Coachella canal have been rescinded in title V of the bill.

Operation and maintenance

An appropriation of \$19 million has been allowed for the activities under this head. This is a reduction of \$4,154,000 below the budget estimate, but only \$500,000 below the amount available in the current fiscal year. Of the amount allowed, \$1,942,778 is derived from the Colorado River Dam fund for use on the Boulder Canyon project and at Boulder City in accordance with the schedules set out in the justifications. A total of \$1,300,000 of the appropriation is to be derived

from the general fund of the Treasury to cover the budget estimates of \$50,000 for the Imperial Dam project, \$750,000 for the Colorado River front work and levee system, and \$500,000 for the soil and moisture conservation operations.

Reluctance on the part of the Bureau to finally wind up a project and turn it over to the water users for operation is still very much in evidence. It is also apparent that a number of the water-user organizations have not been overly aggressive in their demands that projects be turned over to them, so long as it appears that the Bureau can obtain funds for operation and maintenance. The committee has for some time tried to generate some energy in the Bureau to get completed projects and units of projects turned over to the water users as is originally contemplated when irrigation projects are undertaken. The apparent inertia of the Bureau in this matter leaves the committee with no alternative but to force the issue by curtailing the operation and maintenance funds requested for appropriation. A positive effort to turn over irrigation projects wherever possible, plus improved efficiency in the use of Bureau personnel on power facilities should permit continuation of an adequate operation and maintenance program within the funds allowed in the bill.

The attention of the committee has been directed to the so-called incremental value provision which has been included in irrigation project repayment contracts as an anti-speculation device. This provision controls the amount of money that may be realized by an owner from sale of his property in the early years of project operation. The effect of this has been to create credit difficulties with private lending agencies for the owners of the project lands just at the time when they most need it for tooling up and for making improvements which will get their lands into maximum production. The Secretary is urged to carefully review those contracts in which such a provision exists, to eliminate it, and, if necessary, substitute some reasonable measure for controlling speculation.

General administrative expenses

The budget estimate for general administrative expenses of the Bureau is \$4,300,000. The committee has allowed an appropriation of \$3,500,000, a reduction of \$800,000 below the budget and \$1 million below the amounts available in the current fiscal year. It is the committee's opinion that a realistic and determined effort to reduce or eliminate unnecessary offices, services, and personnel along the general lines set out in the recommendations of the Secretary's survey team on the Bureau of Reclamation will permit a reduction in general administrative costs to the amount allowed.

Emergency fund

While funds were not requested for emergency use in the budget estimate, the committee has provided \$200,000 to assure continuous operation of irrigation and power systems in the event of unforeseen failures and emergencies which may occur during the year. The amount which has been allowed is one-half of the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Surveys, investigations, and research

The budget estimate for the activities of the Geological Survey is \$27,335,000, of which \$1,475,000 was for investigations and surveys in the Missouri River Basin. The committee has allowed an appropriation of \$25,362,685. The reduction consists of the \$1,475,000 for the Missouri River Basin work, for which funds are provided in the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation, and an additional amount of \$497,315, to bring the appropriation back to the 1953 level. Including the appropriation recommended, all transferred

funds, and contributions, the Survey will have available to it approximately \$43 million during the 1955 fiscal year.

The activities of the Survey in Washington are carried on in 16 different buildings, some of them old and unsafe for housing the highly valuable maps and mapping equipment concentrated in the metropolitan area. In the event of fire or other damage, the Survey's maps and mapping equipment could be replaced only at tremendous cost and over a long period of time. In order to speed up existing plans for improving this situation, language has been included in the bill to permit the preparation of plans and specifications for a new building or buildings to meet the Geological Survey's special needs in the Washington area, subject to the enactment of lease-purchase or other authorizing legislation.

BUREAU OF MINES

Conservation and development of mineral resources

The budget estimate for activities under this heading is \$13,750,000. The committee has allowed \$12,564,000, a reduction of \$1,186,000 below the budget and \$3,364,180 below the appropriation for 1954. The budget estimate includes \$100,000 for activities in the Missouri River Basin area for which money is being provided under the "Construction and rehabilitation" item in the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation. Specific reductions have been made in various programs of the Bureau under this heading as set forth in the following table:

Item	Budget estimate	Reduction	Allowed in bill
Fuels:			
Coal.....	\$1,850,000	\$245,785	\$1,604,215
Petroleum and natural gas.....	1,250,000	340,415	909,585
Synthetic liquid fuels.....	4,099,000	213,800	3,885,200
Helium.....	90,000	-----	90,000
Minerals and metals:			
Ferrous metals and alloys.....	1,993,000	93,000	1,900,000
Nonferrous metals.....	2,525,000	125,000	2,400,000
Nonmetallic minerals.....	818,000	43,000	775,000
Mineral research, unclassified.....	825,000	125,000	700,000
Control of fires in inactive coal deposits.....	300,000	-----	300,000
Total.....	13,750,000	1,186,000	12,564,000

Within the amount allowed \$55,000 is to be used for completion of the mine flood studies in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania and for preparation of final reports on this study.

The Bureau of Mines has been putting out an excessive volume of press releases, miscellaneous statistical data, and other information about its program and personnel. In the general provisions of the bill pertaining to the Department of the Interior the committee has reduced the amount of money to be used throughout the Department for information purposes. It is believed that much of the savings dictated by this reduction can be achieved through reduction in the number of Bureau of Mines press releases, pamphlets, and other publications, as well as some of the personnel engaged in producing these materials.

Health and safety

The committee has allowed the budget estimate of \$5 million for the activities under this head. This amount represents a reduction of \$60,000 below the appropriation for 1954. The funds will be used for the vital safety enforcement activities of the Bureau which have demonstrated their effectiveness in reducing injuries and the loss of life resulting from mine accidents.

General administrative expenses

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$850,000 a reduction of \$400,000 be-

low the budget estimate of \$1,250,000 and \$450,000 below the 1954 fiscal year appropriation. The regionalization of this Bureau which took place several years ago has been constantly under question by the committee with respect to its contribution to efficiency and lower administrative costs. Little or no evidence along this line has been forthcoming to date.

The committee has included language in the bill to provide that not more than half of the total amount of money, including direct appropriations and transferred funds, that were used for administrative positions in the regional offices during the fiscal year 1954, shall be available in the current fiscal year for this purpose.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection

An appropriation of \$9 million has been allowed. This is a reduction of \$750,000 below the budget estimate of \$9,750,000, but an increase of \$130,450 above the amount available in the fiscal year 1954. In making the reduction in the budget estimate the committee has disallowed \$180,000 programed for activities in the Missouri River Basin and has made provision for such activities under the "Construction and rehabilitation" item in the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation. In applying the remaining reduction of \$570,000, no change is to be made in the amounts programed specifically for positions in the national park and monument areas with the exception of Cape Hatteras for which a general reduction from \$110,000 to \$55,000 has been made.

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities

The budget request for the activities under this head is \$8,850,000. The committee has allowed \$8 million which is \$300,000 below the current appropriation and at the level of the amount available in 1953. For some years, the National Park Service has been maintaining roads outside of the boundaries of the national parks and monuments. In view of the revenues which these national sites bring to the States in which they are located through increased business in the areas, gasoline taxes, etc., it appears unreasonable that the Federal Government should stand the expense of maintaining such roads.

The committee, therefore, has put language into the bill to preclude expenditures for this purpose and disallowed \$100,000 which is the estimated amount for such maintenance. It is believed that the remaining portion of the cut can be absorbed through efficient use of men and materials without affecting the current level of the program.

Construction

An appropriation of \$8,056,099 is recommended, a reduction of \$5,860,201 below the 1954 appropriation and \$543,901 below the budget estimate of \$8,600,000. In arriving at the amount allowed the committee has made the following adjustments in the funds for items under this heading:

Item	Budget estimate	Increase or decrease	Allowed in bill
Natchez Trace Parkway.....	\$100,000	+\$500,000	\$600,000
Black Hills areas—Mount Rushmore.....	-----	+250,000	250,000
Roosevelt Island.....	-----	+50,000	50,000
Isle Royale.....	21,800	+56,099	77,899
Colonial National Park.....	25,000	+50,000	75,000
Carlsbad Caverns.....	1,625,000	-1,450,000	175,000
All other items.....	6,828,200	-----	6,828,200
Total.....	8,600,000	-543,901	8,056,099

The additional funds provided for the Natchez-Trace Parkway will provide for some paving of already graded sections and consequently reduce the high annual cost of

maintaining unsurfaced roadway in an area of heavy rainfall.

The funds for Mount Rushmore are to provide additional buildings and utilities to fit a general improvement program involving road relocation and parking area surfacing for which the State highway commission will spend \$293,000. The Federal expenditure is to be repaid at an estimated rate of \$25,000 per year by the concessionaire, Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, in general accordance with the proposal outlined by the society's president in the hearings on the bill. None of the funds allowed in the bill are to be obligated until the contract with the concessionaire has been revised to provide for this additional revenue so that the Federal investment will be repaid.

Of the funds allowed for the Carlsbad Caverns, \$50,000 is to provide waiting room facilities at the mouth of the caverns. The amounts provided for Isle Royale and Roosevelt Island will permit various improvements and minimum facilities for visitor shelter and safety at these locations. The additional Colonial National Park funds are to be used for plans and construction work on a new Liberty monument to be located on Surrender Field at Yorktown.

General administration expenses

An appropriation of \$900,000 is recommended. This is a reduction of \$368,000 below the budget estimate of \$1,268,000 and a reduction of the same amount below the appropriation for 1954. It is urged that the park superintendents be given greater latitude for decision and program execution within the areas managed by them. In order to assure that regional office organizations will not complicate this assignment of larger responsibility to the superintendents, language has been put into the bill to limit the total amount available for regional office positions from any appropriation in the bill to \$500,000.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Management of resources

The budget estimate for activities under this head is \$6,600,000. An appropriation of \$6,137,000 is recommended. This is a reduction of \$463,000 below the budget estimate and \$863,000 below the amount available in 1954. In making the reduction, \$135,000 programed for activities in the Missouri River Basin has been deleted since these activities are provided for under the "Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. The funds programed for personal services have been reduced from \$4,579,413 to \$4,250,000, a reduction of \$329,413. A further reduction of \$46,441 has been made in the funds programed for travel expenses.

Of the amount allowed \$10,000 is to be used to continue the program for the control of blackbirds in New Jersey.

Investigations of resources

An appropriation of \$3,500,000 has been allowed for activities under this head. This is a reduction of \$527,000 below the budget estimate and \$960,000 below the amount available in fiscal 1954. The committee is convinced that a careful review of the Bureau's research and investigative activities will permit some reductions without disturbing the research projects that are actually essential.

Construction

The budget estimate for this activity is \$300,000. The committee has allowed \$225,000, a reduction of \$75,000 below the budget estimate and \$210,600 below the program for 1954. In applying the funds allowed, not more than 2 residences are to be constructed—1 at the Frankfort, Ky., hatchery at a cost not to exceed \$12,000, and 1 at Bethel, Alaska, at a cost not to exceed \$30,000. In addition, \$35,000 is to be used for improve-

ments and repairs at the Inks Dam hatchery near Bennett, Tex.

General administrative expenses

An appropriation of \$725,000 has been allowed, a reduction of \$50,000 below the budget estimate and the same amount below the funds available in the current fiscal year. It is expected that this moderate reduction can be readily absorbed in view of the reductions which have been made in the programs of this Bureau.

Administrative provisions

Three aircraft, for replacement only, have been provided for use in Alaska.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Administration of Territories

The budget estimate for the items under this heading is \$3,775,000. The committee has allowed \$3,234,471, a reduction of \$540,529 below the budget estimate and \$786,829 below the amount available for the current year. The amounts allowed under the respective items in this appropriation are as follows:

Item	Budget estimate	Reduction	Amount allowed
Territory of Alaska:			
Governor's Office.....	\$97,400	-----	\$97,400
Legislative expenses.....	48,000	\$3,000	45,000
Care and custody of Alaskan insane.....	784,600	-----	784,600
Territory of Hawaii:			
Governor's Office.....	41,600	-----	41,600
Legislative expenses.....	46,700	-----	46,700
Virgin Islands:			
Governor's Office.....	318,000	18,000	300,000
Grants to municipalities.....	500,000	100,000	400,000
Guam:			
Governor's Office.....	53,400	3,400	50,000
Legislative expenses.....	23,300	3,300	20,000
American Samoa:			
Governor's Office.....	56,400	-----	56,400
Grants.....	1,434,000	334,000	1,000,000
Legislative expenses.....	28,000	8,000	20,000
Chief Justice and High Court.....	32,600	8,829	23,771
Canton Island Administration.....	9,000	-----	9,000
General administration.....	302,000	62,000	240,000
Total.....	3,775,000	540,529	3,234,471

The principal reductions in the above table are in the "Grants" items for the Virgin Islands and for American Samoa. With respect to the Virgin Islands the reduction will be offset by increased revenues estimated at the time of the hearings for the current fiscal year. The committee sees no reason why a surplus in the local revenues should not be applied to the activities for which direct appropriations are requested. A reduction of \$200,000 made in the American Samoa grants item was offered to the committee by the Governor. It is believed that the remaining portion of the cut can easily be absorbed through a careful review and reevaluation of the program in American Samoa.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

The budget estimate of \$5,825,000 for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has been entirely disallowed. As indicated in reports on the bills for the last two years, an appropriation under this head would be subject to a point of order when the bill comes before the House of Representatives since organic legislation has not been enacted. The committee recognizes that some appropriation will be necessary for administration of this critical area. It is hoped that organic legislation will be adopted before the conference on the bill.

Alaska public works

The budget estimate of \$5 million has been allowed. This is a reduction of \$7 million below the program for the current fiscal year. The Alaskan communities benefiting under this public works program are required to

finance 50 percent of the costs of all projects undertaken.

Construction of roads, Alaska

An appropriation of \$7 million has been allowed. This is a reduction of \$2,940,000 below the budget estimate and \$7,600,000 below the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1954. Of the amount allowed \$700,000 is to be used for construction on the Copper River road.

The most recent General Accounting Office audit report on the Alaska Roads Commission points out that "Obligations have been made on specific major construction projects in excess of the amounts originally in the justifications. In at least one project funds were expended prior to submission to the Congress of justifications of appropriations for the project."

The committee will not tolerate deviations from the programs set forth in the justifications, which are the basis for its actions in considering the budget request. Any further evidence of such juggling of funds will be the basis for appropriate action with respect to those responsible for such decisions.

Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska

The budget request for this item was \$3,500,000. The committee has allowed \$3 million, a reduction of \$500,000 below the estimate, and the same amount that is available during the current fiscal year. The committee is convinced that efficient use of personnel and equipment will permit an adequate maintenance program.

Construction, Alaska Railroad

An appropriation of \$7,494,000 has been allowed. This is a reduction of \$4,500,000 below the budget, but an increase of \$3,279,000 above the 1954 appropriation. Within the amount allowed, \$2,900,000 is for completion of the Seward dock which was begun in the current fiscal year. The remaining \$4,594,000 is for permanent improvements on the Seward-Portage section of the Railroad. The committee notes with satisfaction that the Alaska Railroad will operate in the black this year.

Virgin Islands public works

The budget estimate of \$890,000 for this program has been disallowed. The funds requested were for the construction and equipping of another elementary school at Charlotte-Amalie on St. Thomas Island. School population and capacity statistics given the committee at the time of the hearings indicate that additional school construction at this time is not an urgent necessity.

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Salaries and expenses

The budget estimate for the administrative offices at the secretarial level in the Department of the Interior is \$2,330,000. The committee has allowed an appropriation of \$2,200,000, a reduction of \$130,000 below the budget estimate and \$125,000 below the amount available in the current fiscal year. It is the committee's opinion that the substantial program reductions which have been made throughout the Department in the last 2 years warrant at least this modest reduction in the cost of top administration.

In accordance with the previously expressed wishes of the committee, the Solicitor outlined, at the time of the hearings, a general program for consolidating all legal services of the Department into a separate organization under his control. Specific details concerning bill language and appropriation adjustments to accomplish this purpose were not available in time for hearings on the subject. Consequently, the committee has not acted to implement the proposed reorganization. However, the plan appears

to be sound and it is hoped that it can be properly authorized and implemented for the fiscal year 1955.

A number of bureaus of the Department have avoided the limitations placed on purchase of passenger vehicles by having a box end mounted on the rear end of business coupes and counting them as pickup trucks. No further purchases of this type are to be made without specific authorization. While the decision was made to disallow all of the 800 passenger motor vehicles requested by the Department before this antic came to the committee's attention, it helps to sup-

port the general opinion that the entire matter of motor vehicles needs a thorough review by the Office of the Secretary.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Grants

An appropriation of \$439,924 is recommended for nonrevenue producing activities of the Virgin Islands Corporation and to compensate for operating losses of the Corporation for the fiscal year 1953. The committee sees no reason why it should continue to accept a deficit budget for the revenue-producing operations of the Virgin

Islands Corporation and has consequently reduced the estimate by \$242,076 requested to cover operating losses in the fiscal year 1955.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Salaries and expenses

The budget estimate of \$75,000 has been allowed for this review board. The board's function is to hear and rule on appeals from orders of the Bureau of Mines looking to the closing of operating coal mines in the matter of safety enforcement, as required by Public Law 552 of the 82d Congress.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Budget estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriations	1955 estimates
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Connally Hot Oil Act, enforcement of.....	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$125,000	—\$25,000	—\$25,000
Southeastern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance.....	1,130,000	1,450,000	1,228,000	+98,000	—222,000
Southwestern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance.....	1,600,000	1,030,000	275,000	—1,325,000	—755,000
(Continuing fund) ¹	(1,200,000)			(—1,200,000)	
Research in utilization of saline water.....	400,000	400,000	255,000	—145,000	—145,000
Oil and Gas Division.....	447,500	300,000	100,000	—347,500	—200,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	3,727,500	3,330,000	1,983,000	—1,744,500	—1,347,000
Commission of Fine Arts.....	21,200	21,200	21,200		
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Construction.....	\$38,866,000	\$30,200,000	\$18,915,000	—\$19,951,000	—\$11,285,000
Operation and maintenance.....	6,004,000	6,000,000	5,000,000	—1,004,000	—1,600,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....	44,870,000	36,800,000	23,915,000	—20,955,000	—12,885,000
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of lands and resources.....	11,483,000	11,625,000	11,483,000		—142,000
Construction.....	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000		—1,000,000
(Range improvements) ²	(574,654)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(+85,346)	(.....)
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	13,483,000	14,625,000	13,483,000		—1,142,000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Health, education, and welfare services.....	52,000,000	54,105,320	52,000,000		—2,105,320
Resources management.....	13,253,760	13,092,910	12,592,910	—660,850	—500,000
Construction.....	15,869,000	10,336,000	7,673,000	—8,196,000	—2,663,000
General administrative expenses.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,750,000	—250,000	—250,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds.....	84,122,760	80,534,230	75,015,910	—9,106,850	—5,518,320
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation).....	(5,040,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(—40,000)	
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION					
General investigations.....	3,000,000	6,000,000	3,000,000		—3,000,000
Construction and rehabilitation.....	116,269,660	121,838,000	114,479,700	—1,789,960	—7,358,300
Operation and maintenance.....	19,500,000	23,154,000	19,000,000	—500,000	—4,154,000
General administrative expenses.....	4,500,000	4,300,000	3,500,000	—1,000,000	—800,000
Emergency fund.....	400,000		200,000	—200,000	+200,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	143,669,660	155,292,000	140,179,700	—3,489,960	—15,112,300
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	27,750,000	27,335,000	25,362,685	—2,387,315	—1,972,315
BUREAU OF MINES					
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	15,928,180	13,750,000	12,564,000	—3,364,180	—1,186,000
Health and safety.....	5,060,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	—60,000	
Construction.....	425,000			—425,000	
General administrative expense.....	1,300,000	1,250,000	850,000	—450,000	—400,000
Total, Bureau of Mines.....	22,713,180	20,000,000	18,414,000	—4,299,180	—1,586,000
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Management and protection.....	8,869,550	9,750,000	9,000,000	+130,450	—750,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	8,300,000	8,850,000	8,000,000	—300,000	—850,000
Construction.....	13,916,300	8,600,000	8,056,099	—5,860,201	—543,901
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization).....	1,500,000			—1,500,000	
General administrative expenses.....	1,268,000	1,268,000	900,000	—368,000	—368,000
Total, National Park Service.....	33,853,850	28,468,000	25,956,099	—7,897,751	—2,511,901
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
Management of resources.....	7,000,000	6,600,000	6,137,000	—863,000	—463,000
Investigations of resources.....	4,460,000	4,027,000	3,500,000	—960,000	—527,000
Construction.....	435,600	300,000	225,000	—210,600	—75,000
General administrative expenses.....	775,000	775,000	725,000	—50,000	—50,000
(Administration of Pribilof Islands) ³	(1,995,731)	(1,650,000)	(1,650,000)	(—345,731)	(.....)
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service.....	12,670,600	11,702,000	10,587,000	—2,083,600	—1,115,000

¹ Additional \$520,000 proposed for transfer from available construction funds.

² Additional \$775,000 transferred from available construction funds.

³ Receipts from sale of power and energy, not included in totals of this tabulation.

⁴ Comparable.

⁵ Indefinite appropriation of receipts, not included in totals of this tabulation.

⁶ Excludes \$62,000 for activities transferred to the Agriculture Research Service.

⁷ Includes \$2,630,000 for activities transferred in the bill to the construction and rehabilitation appropriation.

⁸ Includes \$83,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954.

⁹ Indefinite appropriation of receipts. Not included in totals of this tabulation.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1954, estimates for 1955, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1955—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1954	Budget estimates, 1955	Recommended in bill for 1955	Bill compared with—	
				1954 appropriations	1955 estimates
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
Administration of Territories.....	4,021,300	3,775,000	3,234,471	—786,829	—540,529
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	4,300,000	5,825,000	—	—4,300,000	—5,825,000
Alaska public works.....	12,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	—7,000,000	—
Construction of roads, Alaska.....	14,600,000	9,940,000	7,000,000	—7,600,000	—2,940,000
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska.....	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,000,000	—	—500,000
Construction, Alaska Railroad.....	4,215,000	11,994,000	7,494,000	+3,279,000	—4,500,000
Virgin Islands public works.....	1,100,000	890,000	—	—1,100,000	—890,000
Total, Office of Territories.....	43,236,300	40,924,000	25,728,471	—17,507,829	—15,195,529
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,325,000	2,330,000	2,200,000	—125,000	—130,000
Total, Department of the Interior.....	432,443,050	421,361,430	362,846,065	—69,596,985	—58,515,365
VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION					
Revolving fund.....	1,028,000	—	—	—1,028,000	—
Grants.....	1,080,000	682,000	439,924	—640,076	—242,076
(Administrative expenses) ¹²	(130,000)	(130,000)	(130,000)	(—)	(—)
Total, Virgin Islands Corporation.....	2,108,000	682,000	439,924	—1,668,076	—242,076
FEDERAL COAL-MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
Salaries and expenses.....	80,000	75,000	75,000	—5,000	—
Grand total.....	434,631,050	422,118,430	363,360,989	—71,270,061	—58,757,441

¹⁰ Includes \$239,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954.

¹¹ Includes \$300,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954.

¹² Corporate funds not included in totals of this tabulation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, it will be noted that the budget estimate called for \$422,118,430. The amount recommended in the bill is \$363,360,989; or a total cut of \$58,757,441. However, \$5,825,000 of the cut is represented in the committee's deleting the appropriations requested for the Trust Territory Islands of the Pacific, the reason being that the basic organic act has not yet been passed by Congress for the Trust Islands which were mandated to us under the United Nations Charter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. When were they given to us in trust?

Mr. JENSEN. Under the United Nations Charter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Back in 1946?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. Because of the fact that there is no authorization for an appropriation by the Congress, if we had approved this amount or any amount in the pending bill for the Trust Islands, it would have been subject to a point of order.

We did the same thing last year in the hope that the organic act might be passed before the Congress adjourned or before the Senate had marked up its bill; however, the organic act has not yet been adopted by the Congress. We are hoping, of course, it will be adopted before the Senate committee marks up its bill. We know that it takes money to administer the business of the Trust Islands. We have an area out there 1,000 miles north and south and 3,000 miles long, with thousands of islands that are under our jurisdiction at this time and have been since 1946 under the United Nations Charter. However, there are only about 125 of the islands that are populated. Whether or not organic law

is passed by the Congress before we adjourn, it will be necessary to make an appropriation for this purpose.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Under what committee jurisdiction would that organic law come?

Mr. JENSEN. It would come under the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House.

Mr. Chairman, some adjustments have been made in funds for various reclamation projects. The construction program, however, is only \$1,790,000 below the present year.

Here is one thing a lot of people will be glad to know. I want to refer to the funds which come into the Federal Treasury from all Interior Department agencies, such as the Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Land Management, the Reclamation Service, the revenues from power-producing facilities, and from other sources.

For the fiscal year 1953 there was received \$242,441,757, which was paid into the Treasury of the United States from the different agencies of the Interior Department. In 1954 the sum of \$265,884,418 was paid in from those sources and in the fiscal year 1955 it is estimated that \$288,885,209 will be covered into the Treasury of the United States from the Interior Department agencies.

Now, a lot of that money, especially from the irrigation and reclamation projects, of course, goes into what we call the reclamation fund and is appropriated out of the reclamation fund instead of out of the general fund of the Treasury. This year we have appropriated in the neighborhood of \$77 million out of the reclamation fund for irrigation and reclamation projects in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered also that since World War II began very few new starts have been made for irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric projects. There is, of course, a very good reason for that. We have been required to spend great sums of money to wage wars, and we are still spending for defense; thence, there is not enough money to go around to do everything we would like to do for America. I am sure there is hardly a single Member of the Congress who is not interested in western reclamation and the other things that are vital to the Western States, and hence, in turn, to develop this great America of ours. However, the Department of the Interior has asked for new starts and the President has approved a number of new starts amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars. Shortly after the Easter recess our committee will meet to consider a number of those new starts that the Department of the Interior has requested. So before the end of this session, without a doubt, there will be money provided for a number of new starts.

All the way through this bill you will note that we have made some reductions in personnel. While the Department of the Interior, as many other departments of the Government have, has reduced personnel to quite a marked degree, there is still a lot of room for reducing personnel. In this bill we have reduced personnel; we have recommended cuts dollarwise that would reduce the present personnel of the Department of the Interior about 10 percent, which effects a saving in the neighborhood of \$20 million. That cut is commensurate with the program reductions which have been made and can be absorbed in large degree by not filling vacancies. So about two-fifths of the reduction in this bill is effected by simply cutting out unnecessary personnel. The people of America

are still spending in the neighborhood of \$12 billion a year to pay people who work for the Government. Certainly that is not necessary by any stretch of the imagination, and I hope that we can continue to reduce that personnel to the degree that it should be reduced.

The overall cut in this bill amounts to 12.5 percent below the budget.

We have increased the budget on a number of items, irrigation and reclamation items in the West, where the committee felt that the Bureau of the Budget had cut too deeply. You will find a record of those on page 10, which sets out all of the reclamation and irrigation and multipurpose projects now under construction all over America.

We have, as you will note, made a considerable cut in regional offices personnel for the Park Service. The Park Service saw fit to increase the number of regional offices from 4 to 6. As one member of the committee, I feel that regional offices in the Park Service are an unnecessary entity. I should much prefer, and I think it would be proper, to have, instead of regional offices in the Park Service, possibly 10 roving auditors, going from park to park to see that the business of the parks is carried on in a proper, businesslike manner.

First, of course, it is necessary to employ good men to be superintendents of these parks and national monuments, and then put the responsibility on them to run their business in a businesslike manner and in an economical manner. That is true of every department of Government, not only the Interior Department. It should be done in every department; because, certainly, if you give a man responsibilities, if he is the right man, he is going to take a great interest in seeing to it that his agency or his business is run right, instead of having to go to some district or regional office, or some other place, to find out whether he is doing the right thing or not. That is what should be done, because otherwise red tape and unnecessary expenses are created.

I bring that up because, without a doubt, a number of the Members have had letters from their people who think that the Park Service has not been treated properly so far as funds are concerned. We are now appropriating almost four times more for management and maintenance of facilities than we did 10 years ago and yet there are folks who will tell you that we have not been fair with the Park Service.

As to the Indian Service, you will note that we have scarcely reduced the appropriation for that service. Mr. McKay, the Secretary of the Interior, appointed a businessman, Glen Emmons, of Gallup, N. Mex., to be the Director of the Indian Bureau. Mr. Emmons has lived with the Navaho Indians in that territory for many, many years. He is working hard to get that agency on a businesslike basis.

You will note that we have about 12,000 Navaho children of school age who are not in school today. It has been a big problem. We are gradually reducing that number, by building schools and by furnishing trailer schools. We have now, I believe, four trailer schools which follow the nomad Indian around, be-

cause he follows his herd, winter and summer. You may say, Why should we do that? Well, I will tell you why we do that. It is because Uncle Sam promised those Indians in a treaty that we would furnish a school and a teacher for every 35 children. In this bill we have appropriated \$460,000 for 20 more trailer schools and for 30 more teachers.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa for pointing out to the House that we are getting over a quarter of a billion dollars from these various agencies in revenue to the Federal Government. In addition, may I point out that we receive revenues which are being paid from year to year from irrigation projects in taxes, which would not have been possible but for these irrigation projects. I have understood the Bureau has made some estimates as to how much that amounts to, and it runs into the millions of dollars. Does the gentleman from Iowa know about those estimates?

Mr. JENSEN. I am afraid I cannot give the gentleman any information that would be worthy of the name at this time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is very interesting, however. It shows that millions of dollars are coming in in the form of tax revenues that would not have been possible except for such developments.

Mr. JENSEN. It is an unknown quantity, the gentleman must admit that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is true; it is just an estimate.

Mr. JENSEN. However, we know that it is large.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to read one line from the report:

However, these lower figures are dictated in large measure by the urgent need for conserving dollars to improve the present Federal Government fiscal position.

I made the statement to the full committee last week when the subcommittee was reporting this bill to the full committee that if I came back to Congress I would make every effort to get off this committee, because if about two more cuts are made such as is made in the present bill, there will be no more Interior Department. Since the Department was founded about 125 years ago there have been 27 agencies moved out of it. It is down now to where we are coming in here with a bill for \$363 million. The request to the Budget Bureau was \$422 million. The cut was \$58 million, \$71 million below last year.

Let us take a look at the record.

Every year when I come down on the floor of this Congress in connection with this bill I do not call for politics. I do not care whether the Democratic or the Republican Party is in power so far as this agency is concerned. This is one of the old agencies of the Government. The reclamation end of it was put through this Congress by a great President, Theodore Roosevelt. Down through the years, instead of their doing

their job and doing their business conserving and looking after this Nation and getting very few dollars they could ever spend on America, just about the time they got around to spending a few dollars to protect and save and serve this country they find they have to have cuts.

Let us take a look at the first agencies. Let us go to the parks. There is only one Yellowstone Park in the world. That is the work of God. That is not the work of the Americans or the Congress or anything like that. God created and built that park. It was my privilege to spend 6 days there a few years ago. While I was there with my wife I saw seven people drown. I went to the chief ranger when the seventh person drowned and I said, "Why don't you help these people who are drowning? Why don't you try to help to save them?" He said, "Congressman we don't have a row boat, let alone a motor boat in Yellowstone Park." If there was any little summer resort in the United States that allowed such a thing as that to happen, why the damage suits would go all through the courts of that State. But not so with this Nation.

The appropriation bill for Yellowstone Park was cut so 2 or 3 years ago that we could not even hire the people to collect the fee for the public to visit the park. It costs \$2 to get into the park. They were so shy on men and labor that the man who collected the tickets only worked one trick. When the people found out that he was working on the first trick, they went into the park during the second trick. When they found out he was working on the second trick, they went in on the first trick. The park appropriation was cut so that we did not even have the personnel to collect \$3 at the gate.

Let us take the Indian Bureau. The chairman who preceded me, a gentleman every inch of him, said that we had a contract with the Indians and that if they went on the reservations peacefully, we would build a schoolhouse for every 35 children, and not only that but we have 400 ironclad contracts and agreements with the Indians. I tossed this challenge out. There was never a day that the United States Government ever kept her contracts or her word with the people who used to own this country—the Indians—not 1 day. Is that not a fine thing that we want to sell to the rest of the world—Americanism—we are the people who should have courtesy and respect and the love in their heart. Just stop and think what we have done to the people who owned this country.

Between the Mexican border and Tucson, Ariz., there is a tribe of Indians known as the Papagos. It is a 90-mile reservation and there is a highway cut right through the middle of it. Right down through that reservation, there is this highway with 45 miles of reservation on each side of the highway. It used to be that when an Indian had tuberculosis or pneumonia, what he had to do was to crawl his weary bones to that emergency hospital. But, a couple of years ago, it burned down.

I said before that it was my privilege to be in a camp where displaced persons were in Europe. Many of them were

just enclosures of about a square mile. They must have had dozens of American doctors there and maybe 20 nurses or so, all being kept there with American dollars with the best of care and the best of medicine and the best of everything. But the men and the real Americans, the Indians, cannot even get an emergency hospital from us.

There is nothing that an Indian can make a living at on the reservation. You hear somebody say, why do we not get out from under the Indians. Stop and think. What chance would an Indian have in industry today? Yesterday, I saw where 10 percent cannot even be drafted in this country because they are not capable of meeting the requirements that they have to have to be a soldier—let alone work in industry. And they say that we want to get out from under the fellows who owned this country. What people we are.

Take a look at all the nations of the world that have fallen by the wayside. Look at the countries that have fallen in centuries gone by. Look at Persia. At one time, Persia was able to support 10 million people in luxury. Today, she cannot support 1 million people in poverty. And that is just because they did something that we are doing. Instead of looking after our water resources and reclamation projects in every State of the Union, we are neglecting them. Let me give you an illustration of the town that I happen to represent. There is nothing in this bill that would help that town. There is no reclamation project involved there. Ten years ago it was the fourth largest steel center in the world. All the reserve water they had was 11 billion gallons to take care of the fourth largest steel center in the world. The Government built two reservoirs. Last year we had those reservoirs filled with water, 70 billion gallons, and they ran out of water. Suppose we were back on the 10-billion-gallon reserve. Now we have to try to get a reservoir three times bigger than the three that are already there, in order to keep those steel plants open. Yet in this bill we call it economy. We are going to help the Government by failing to spend a few billion dollars on this great country, America. The wealth of America should be protected and more money spent on this great country.

In this bill are surveys on coal, oil, lumber, gas, iron ore, all the minerals in the United States. Instead of spending billions of dollars in this bill to look after every State in the Union which produces the things that make us great, make us wealthy, makes our standard of living, each year we are cutting it down and cutting it down until in a few more years we will have none.

Why are we spending a half-billion dollars today in Venezuela and Labrador, looking for ore? Why are we spending millions to drain the rivers and build new railroads, when we should be spending a few billion dollars in this country on pilot work to increase our production in this country? In the State of Minnesota there are billions of tons of ore. Yes, it is probably inferior ore; it is not as good as we will get from Labrador, but it is worth spending a few dollars

to find out if we can use that ore without having to go to the other countries.

Just think of Great Britain. Back in the twenties, when Persia did not have enough powder to fire a salute, England spent billions of dollars on her oil wells and today she is ordered out of that country. Suppose we spend millions of dollars dredging the rivers of Venezuela or any foreign country, 10 years from now they will say, "No dice. The fellow who signed that contract is dead." Out we go. Whoever thought it could happen to Great Britain? Yet it will happen to us if we will not spend a few dollars on the greatest country on earth.

I repeat it is not the work of man but the work of God. You take all the rest of the countries and roll them into one and it would not make a patch on this country. Just think of our Fish and Wildlife Agency. Instead of spending millions of dollars, we spend only a few dollars on that every year. When you think of the fisherman with his gum coat and his hip boots and his costly poles, using his automobile and gasoline, standing around a lake or stream trying to catch one fish, and yet we do not spend a dollar to find out even if there are fish in the stream. Oh, no, we have a lot to learn. I do not care whether it is on the Republican side or the Democratic side; I am not taking politics into it, but it seems that we spend money on every nation in the world except our own. It is time we learned how to spend some in this country, because it cannot go along the way it has been going the past 300 years, robbing and looting, destroying the forests and the lands for want of irrigation and fertilizer. If any amendments are offered I wish you would stop and look and listen before you vote them down. Remember the money is going to be spent in this country, and the more you spend on it the better will be our standard of living. So I am asking you as a person who is vitally interested, as I know you all are, to see that we spend more money than is in this bill on this great country of ours.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I note in the report a reduction of \$400,000 in administrative expense in the Bureau of Mines. I hope we have not lost sight of the fact that we have a new mine safety law.

It was my pleasure some weeks ago to place in the Record the facts from the first year's operation of this new mine safety law showing the lowest death and injury rate for the mining industry of the country since the formation of the Bureau of Mines.

I would like to have some explanation as to where the \$400,000 cut in administrative costs comes. Does it reduce the number of inspectors? We need more rather than fewer inspectors.

Mr. KIRWAN. No, it does not touch the mine inspectors. I think it has something to do with the staff in Washington and some other places.

Mr. BAILEY. They cannot cut that much from personnel and not get down to the mine inspectors.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is not in the inspection end of it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FENTON, took very great care to see that they did not cut the inspectors in the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. That is part of the administrative cost.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is part of the administrative cost, but as I say, it is not on the inspectors.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to know some details as to just where they are cutting this \$400,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am pleading for more money for these services this afternoon, yet there is not a dime in this bill for my State of Ohio. I take that back, for I think they do spend 25 cents for a wick in the Perry Monument Light. So in asking for funds my State does not benefit.

The great crying need today is for water and we feel it very markedly in Ohio. The Secretary of Agriculture just finished a trip over the country and when he got back to his native Utah he made the statement: "Well, they certainly need aid." He was mistaken when he left the city of Washington, but he discovered as he got over the country something about the country's needs.

I see where the Governor of Ohio has appointed a committee of a hundred to find out what can be done on the flow of water in that State. We have to drill 80 feet deeper than we ever had to in the past to find water. Why does this situation exist? Every drop of water that God lets fall today finds a different situation than existed 30 years ago. Then they did not have drainage ditches along the highways which are necessary in this day of the automobile; when the water fell it stayed there and went into the ground, but now 5 minutes after the rainfall is over the water is on its way to the ocean. We boast of our good highways, but there is no water going into the underground water table. We had better start to do something about it because time is creeping up on us and everything we do is twice as expensive.

If we in this Congress here today and tomorrow do our duty the way we should do it, this bill will carry \$2 billion for America instead of \$363 million.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall next yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], but before I do I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and myself are always in almost perfect agreement on things pertaining to this bill. The gentleman from Ohio has just made a statement about the way we have treated our natural resources in America, and I concur in that statement 100 percent. He never stops informing the people of America of our need for the conservation of our natural resources, and certainly it is an honor to serve with a fine, patriotic gentleman like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

I now yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], chairman of our subcommittee handling matters pertaining to the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has taken a great interest in these two agencies,

and he is in position to answer any questions which may be directed to him relative to any cut that has been made in this bill or anything else pertaining to the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. As I said before, he has great interest in these two agencies to see that funds in proper amount are appropriated for them.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], has given you an idea of the amount of work that has been done by this Subcommittee on Appropriations. I have enjoyed working with the membership of that subcommittee, regardless of political party lines.

I might say at this time that no one is happier than I am to see our very efficient and capable chairman back on his feet and here in the House of Representatives. We all missed Ben when he was in the hospital, and we certainly thank God that he has been spared to be with us again today. We are also thankful to learn that the other four Members of the House are recovering from the recent attack on the House of Representatives on March 1.

With reference to the other members of our subcommittee, every one of them is a fine, capable gentleman, and, as I said before, I have enjoyed very much working with them.

Generally speaking, we believe that the bill presented here today reflects the judgment of your subcommittee in accordance with the testimony given us by the representatives of the various bureaus of the Department of the Interior.

To conserve time, I will, in the time allotted, make a few remarks on the geological survey, the Bureau of Mines and the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Geological Survey presented a budget estimate of \$27,335,000 of which \$25,362,685 was allowed by the committee. This reduction, however, is due to \$1,475,000 which was for investigations and surveys in the Missouri River Basin and now being provided in the Bureau of Reclamation appropriations. The Bureau was allowed \$27,750,000 for appropriations the current fiscal year.

Included in the amount allowed for the Geological Survey is \$497,315 which brings it up to the level of the 1953 fiscal year appropriations.

Under the directorship of Dr. William E. Wrather, the Geological Survey has done a fine job.

The Bureau, however, has been cramped for office, library, and laboratory space in Washington. I understand that they are scattered in many buildings—15 or 16—and the present setup is very unsatisfactory.

In the past 3 years \$900,000 has been provided to the Bureau to rehabilitate space in Denver and for new space at Menlo Park, Calif.

Of that \$900,000—\$500,000 was used for the Denver and Menlo Park buildings. We have allowed \$75,000 to speed up plans and specifications for the

Washington facility, provided authorizing legislation is enacted.

This authorizing legislation is necessary for a new facility for the Geological Survey because of the danger of all valuable maps and surveys of the United States being destroyed or damaged, should a fire occur in the building in what has been described by Dr. Wrather as a firetrap.

In addition to the regularly appropriated funds the Survey has estimated that they will have around forty to forty-five million dollars from all sources for fiscal 1955.

These additional funds are from contributions from the various States, counties, and municipalities, Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, Foreign Operation Commission, Mutual Security Administration and other Federal agencies; also from the rule of copies of aerial photographs and other records and the sale of property. On page 485 of part 1 of the hearings you will find a statement of appropriations, transferred funds, and contributions.

While topographic surveys and mapping requires almost 50 percent of the appropriations, we find that it is estimated and it will take 30 or 40 years to complete this work in the United States and Alaska at the present rate.

The geologic and mineral resources surveys and mapping absorb 20 percent of the appropriations. However, with the addition of transferred funds and contributions to this particular work we also find that there is more money expended by the Bureau than for any other item.

Present-day governmental policymaking, both national and international, require details concerning minerals and mineral fuels far beyond that required in any previous period of our history.

The development of the machine age, with its enormous increase in the demand for mineral raw materials has come about rapidly. The per capita consumption of minerals in the United States is estimated to have increased by about 250 percent in the past 50 years. More than 100 different mineral commodities are now required by industry as against a total of only 56 in 1900.

Yet with all this progress we find that not more than 12 percent of the continental United States and 1 percent of Alaska is mapped geologically in a manner and on a scale deemed sufficient for present-day usages.

The workload of the Bureau in its geologic survey work for minerals and fuels is growing by leaps and bounds, and it should be a matter of great concern to not only those in the Bureau but every American citizen and taxpayer.

The rentals from leases—oil, gas, and minerals—and the royalties produced make this agency of our Government most important. Revenues are estimated at \$48 million for fiscal 1955 with production valued at \$525 million from some 130,000 leased properties, mines, and wells.

WATER RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS

Never before in the history of this country has the question of our water problem been so acute. Much work

needs to be done, and existing knowledge of the fundamental facts concerning our water resources still are inadequate to meet the ever-increasing need. Our water investigations and reliable data have not been keeping pace with the requirements for purposes of thorough planning, design, and operations of facilities. Better coordination among agencies is needed, so that duplication of effort is reduced to an absolute minimum.

I am in thorough accord with the 1953 report or pamphlet of the United States Chamber of Commerce entitled "Our Water Resources," which, among other things, states:

The program of stream gaging and investigation of underground-water resources on the basis of cooperation between Federal and State Governments, through an established Federal agency such as the Geological Survey, should be maintained at a rate which will furnish the basic data as needed for the orderly conservation and development of water resources.

President Eisenhower, in his message of July 31, 1953, relative to a program designed to conserve and improve our Nation's natural resources, stated that—

Our basic problem is to carry forward the tradition of conservation, improvement, and wise use and development of our land and water resources; it will require comprehensive river basin planning with the cooperation of State and local interests; developments have brought about strong competition for existing water supplies and have stimulated the need for a broader approach in planning new water-resources developments; conserving and improving our land and water resources is high-priority business for all of us.

There is no question in my mind that the No. 1 problem in many parts of our country is water. It is rapidly becoming the principal concern of the entire country.

I have dwelled to a considerable length in the time allotted me to the activities delegated to this fine branch of our Interior Department—the Geological Survey—under the directorship of Dr. Wrather, who received the John Fritz Medal Award on February 4, 1954, which happens to be the highest scientific and engineering recognition and honor any engineer may receive. I know we all agree that the Geologic Survey can be counted on to continue the fine work that it is doing.

The work that this Bureau is doing is so vital to the welfare of our country. It is so basic and fundamental that few people realize its importance. All they apparently are interested in are huge visible monumental projects which blind them to the work of the Geological Survey.

We have been appropriating funds all over this country and out of the country for projects designed to be of assistance in development of those areas. With those objectives we have no complaint.

However, "we should look before we leap" in the future because of the danger of too much appropriations for the big glamorous and "grab all they can" agencies to the detriment of our smaller but indeed most basic agencies such as the Geologic Survey.

BUREAU OF MINES

The United States Bureau of Mines presented a budget estimate for \$20 million dollars for fiscal year 1955. This was in contract to \$22,713,000 which they had for the current fiscal year. The committee allowed them \$18,414,000 or a reduction of \$1,586,000 from the budget estimate and \$4,299,180 from the 1944 appropriations.

Now permit me to say at the outset that as far as I am concerned the amount allowed by the committee should be ample for 1955. I say this because for the past 7 or 8 years I have always supported the Bureau of Mines' requests. They have enjoyed the complete confidence of not only myself but the whole Congress.

However, for the past 2 or 3 years your subcommittee through investigations, etc., has become concerned of an apparent apathy on the part of the Bureau of Mines and the Interior Department to disregard requests for information needed to intelligently mark up the Appropriation bill.

Therefore, if some of the items appear to be reduced too much, I can only say that it is because we do not have the proper information in their so-called justifications.

To be more specific in my criticism of the Department, and especially the Bureau of Mines, we have repeatedly asked them to look over their regionalization setup. We have every reason to believe that reorganization of the Bureau of Mines would be for efficiency and lower administrative costs.

On January 26th of this year, at the outset of our hearings, we repeated our request to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for mineral resources.

BUREAU OF MINES

We requested him to secure for us, if he could, some expression from the Secretary's Survey Committee as to what recommendations they would make in case they were not ready to give us a report by the end of February when we were to mark up this bill.

About 1 month later—February 24, 1954—the chairman, Mr. JENSEN, received a letter from the Assistant Secretary stating that the survey team had not yet completed its work or submitted a preliminary report, although they expected to be back in Washington on February 10. He further said that he had discussed the request of the committee with the survey team and that they had advised that in its opinion the Appropriations Committee can proceed on the Department's present budget request for fiscal 1955 without consideration of the probable effect on the fiscal requirements of the Bureau which would result from its recommendations.

So we have marked up the bill and up until this moment, to the best of my knowledge, we have no further word from them.

The appropriations for the Bureau of Mines are divided into four principal categories, namely:

First. Conservation and development of mineral resources.

Second. Health and safety.

Third. Construction.

Fourth. General administrative expenses.

Those categories are subdivided into many projects, and the category receiving the bulk of the appropriations is conservation and development of mineral resources.

They asked for \$13,750,000 for this work. The committee allowed \$12,564,000—a cut of \$1,186,000.

This decrease has been distributed amongst the various items so that we believe the cuts are small enough to be absorbed and justified.

The health and safety item which includes the mine inspections was not cut a penny from the budget estimate of \$5 million.

In all due respect to the Bureau of Mines, I would like to say that this is the one outstanding feature of its work. In fact it was this particular kind of work that made the Bureau of Mines possible.

The number of accidents—fatal and nonfatal during the year 1953 is the least in the history of coal mining. Table 4 on page 351 of part 1 of the hearings gives you a breakdown of the record.

However, we believe that this death rate and accident rate can be further reduced and I feel sure that the Director of the Bureau of Mines will do his utmost to achieve that goal.

There is no new construction in this bill. None was asked for by the Bureau.

The only other cut that was made was in the general administrative expense item.

The budget allowed them \$1,250,000. The committee cut them \$400,000 which gives them \$850,000 in this bill.

As is indicated in the report on page 14, the committee has included languages in the bill to provide that not more than half of the total amount of money, including direct appropriations and transferred funds that were used for administrative positions in the regional offices during fiscal year 1944, shall be available in the current fiscal year for this purpose.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Budget estimates for the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review of \$75,000 was allowed in full.

This is a relatively new branch of the Interior Department, created by Public Law 552 of the 82d Congress and whose functions are to hear and rule on appeals from orders of the Bureau of Mines, when such orders close down mines, as a result of Federal mine inspections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of my requesting the minority to give him 2 additional minutes to answer some questions?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the gentleman a question about the appropriations for the Bureau of Mines.

I notice on page 14 of the report, in the comments on health and safety in the Bureau of Mines, that last year there was an appropriation of \$5,060,000. The committee eliminated that \$60,000 after making some rather sarcastic comments

upon the Bureau's activity in trying to educate the people of this country in the need of greater mine safety. Apparently that \$60,000 cut is to prevent their carrying on a program of education to improve mine safety.

Going down to the next item on page 14, the budget estimate was reduced to \$850,000 from \$1,250,000, or \$450,000 below the appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 for general administrative expenses. The committee says the intention is to close the regional offices of the Bureau of Mines, not by formally closing them, because that would be beyond the power of the committee, but saying to those people, "You can spend only 50 percent as much money as you spent on personnel in those regional offices," and so forth.

Mr. FENTON. Does the gentleman wish me to answer a question?

Mr. BAILEY. I think I have stated the question. I will listen to the gentleman talk now.

Mr. FENTON. As far as the health and safety item is concerned, the committee did not reduce the budget estimate by 1 penny.

Mr. BAILEY. Then the committee's report must be wrong, as stated on page 14.

Mr. FENTON. I do not think so; it was not reduced by 1 penny.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman has yielded to me and the time was given to him by the minority for that purpose.

Mr. FENTON. That was below the budget estimate of last year, not this year.

Mr. BAILEY. It is also below the budget of this year, is it not?

Mr. FENTON. No; it is not.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I notice, on page 13 of the report, that the synthetic-liquid-fuels program has been reduced from the budget estimate by \$213,800. Will the gentleman explain whether or not this reduction is to be a percentage reduction to the different activities of the synthetic-fuels program or will some activities have to take a larger reduction than others?

Mr. FENTON. The only reduction we have made on the synthetic-liquid-fuels item is in the mining research and processing of the oil shale.

Mr. ASPINALL. At Rifle. That will mean that the work they are doing there will be curtailed to the complete amount of this \$213,800.

Mr. FENTON. That is right. That will give them about \$1 million for that processing.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand, this was done with an evaluation presented by the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. FENTON. That is right.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Can the gentleman inform the House whether or not the Director of the Budget recommended

less than the estimate of the Department?

Mr. FENTON. No; I cannot.

Mr. PERKINS. I notice, on page 28 of the report, where the health and safety money has been cut by \$60,000, from \$5,060,000 to \$5 million.

Mr. FENTON. That was by the Bureau of the Budget, not by your committee.

Mr. PERKINS. There was no attempt on the part of the committee to interfere with the money that has been provided for mine inspectors?

Mr. FENTON. Absolutely none whatever.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to consume very much time because I do not believe it is either advisable or necessary. I do want the Record to show my position on the bill.

An appropriation bill is composed of two things. One is language and the other is money. In this bill, as far as money is concerned, we had a total budget estimate of \$422,118,430. The committee recommends \$363,360,989, a reduction under the budget estimates of \$58,757,441, and a total reduction under the appropriations of last year of \$71,270,061. You may be interested in the language changes which you will find spelled out on page 19 of the report. There are only four of them. Most of them are limitations of expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, if I had been writing this bill, I would not have written it exactly as it is written. In some instances, I would have allowed more money, and in others less. But, by and large, the bill is a good bill and probably better than I would have written. So with 1 or 2 exceptions, I desire to say, I am going along with the bill. I am not planning to offer any amendments. However, in possibly 2 matters, if amendments are offered by others, I may support the same, and while I am not entirely satisfied with the entire bill, I am otherwise supporting it, as it has been reported. It represents a tremendous volume of work on the part of the entire subcommittee and is as good as we were able to write this year.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], who is chairman of the subcommittee on the Bureau of Land Management. He, of course, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, is interested in all of the agencies of the department, as we all are, but I have delegated to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] the handling of the Bureau of Land Management matters because he comes from a reclamation State and is well versed on the things which come under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. He has taken a great interest in that agency, and I am sure any questions which any Member of the Congress desires to ask the gentleman from Idaho will be answered in a forthright manner, as were the questions which were asked of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Before the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], my very good and able friend, takes up another phase of the legislation, and while we are on the Bureau of Mines, I thought perhaps you could answer a question, before we get into another part of the bill.

On page 20 of the report, the Oil and Gas Division, I notice a cut has been made from \$447,500 down to \$100,000—a cut of \$347,500. That would appear to me to be quite a drastic cut. I wonder if the gentleman could give us an explanation and the reason for such a drastic curtailment of the operations of that particular Division.

Mr. JENSEN. You will see on page 4 the answer to your question. The report reads as follows:

OIL AND GAS DIVISION

The budget estimate for this Division is \$300,000. The committee has allowed \$100,000, a reduction of \$200,000 below the budget estimate. Activities of this organization were consolidated with the work of the Petroleum Administration for Defense in 1951 and considerably expanded. While the function of pulling together in one place all current data on petroleum and gas resources and their utilization is a continuing service to both government and industry, the high cost structure proposed in the budget appears to be out of all proportion to the workload involved or the needs for the service rendered. The appropriation allowed compares reasonably with the amounts which were appropriated for these activities prior to the time that they were consolidated with the Petroleum Administration for Defense.

I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is very interested in everything pertaining to oil and petroleum. The Department of the Interior officials who are in charge of this item must have overlooked the thing that I have just explained and which we have explained in the report which I have just read.

Mr. GAVIN. Do you mean to tell me that the Oil and Gas Division did not prepare and present to you a case in justification of their request for the amount requested, \$447,500?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. You say they did not? I cannot understand that.

Mr. JENSEN. We feel that they did not present a good argument for the full \$300,000.

Mr. GAVIN. Is the gentleman satisfied in his own mind that you can take a division that has been allocated \$447,500 and drastically cut them down to \$100,000, a cut of \$347,500? They cannot operate with any degree of efficiency on this amount of money. They cannot coordinate and consolidate the Division with this drastic cut to give satisfaction to the oil and gas interests who are concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman actually thinks they can operate with the \$100,000?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, because in 1949 the same Division had for personnel \$106,000, and they did about the same thing that they are asked to do today. You know and I know that you

are one of the economy-minded Members of the Congress, and I know you do not want to spend money that should not be spent.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly not if not justified.

Mr. JENSEN. I know full well that if the gentleman had sat on that committee as we did and had heard the arguments in justification of the \$300,000, and knowing the past history as the committee knows it, you would have agreed with the committee that we appropriated about the right amount.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, just at a glance, I cannot understand why, even if we are becoming economy-minded, which we should be—there is no question about that—that they can operate efficiently with such a drastic cut. This cut is entirely too much. If the cut had been reasonable, I would say the committee was considerate, but you are cutting them down almost 75 percent from what they have been previously allocated. Whether they can operate with any degree of efficiency is questionable, in my mind, but the gentleman seems to think they can. However, I want to state that I do not believe they can and this cut is entirely too severe.

Mr. JENSEN. The committee thought they could, or we would not have recommended the cut that we did. The gentleman knows as well as I do that there is hardly a Department of Government that is not anxious to keep all of their personnel which they had during the peak of the war. No Member of this Congress can justify maintaining such a great number of personnel that are requested in any of these departments.

Let me point out something else. Here is a case where you have more generals than privates. If you will turn to the hearings, on page 66—

Mr. GAVIN. I will.

Mr. JENSEN. Part I of the hearings, you will see that the average pay for personnel in this agency will average 10.3 grade. That grade pays—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce to the gentleman that he has consumed 7 minutes in his colloquy.

Mr. JENSEN. I will take 1 more minute, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. JENSEN. That grade on an average pays \$6,000.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the type of personnel? Are they scientists, researchers, or specialists in their particular fields?

Mr. JENSEN. Just about an average with the other Departments, and the other Departments do not run near that high. The other Departments run to an average of about \$4,500. I have no fight; we want to do the thing that is right, but they did not make a case for \$300,000, and the situation now is about the same as it was in 1949 when we allowed them a little over \$100,000—\$106,000-plus. Why they should be allowed almost three times more than they were in 1949 just does not make any sense.

Mr. GAVIN. You must admit the work in this Bureau has greatly expanded, and in the past several years they have turned in a fine performance

and could continue to do so if given sufficient to operate efficiently.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope so.

I have promised to yield to about 8 or 10 Members of my side, yet I have only about 8 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNGER. There is no intention on the part of the committee to cut down the financial statistics on oil and gas.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] to take over now, but I shall ask unanimous consent when the gentleman from Idaho gets through to extend the time a few minutes in order that I may answer some questions from other Members.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUDGE. Can the time for general debate be extended by unanimous consent in the Committee?

Mr. RAYBURN. It cannot in the Committee, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. Then tomorrow when we read the bill for amendment I shall to my best to answer any question any Member might have regarding this bill.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, can the Chair advise me as to the time remaining on the majority side?

The CHAIRMAN. The majority side has 6 minutes of general debate remaining.

Mr. BUDGE. Then, with the permission of the Chair I shall reserve my time until the other side concludes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. How much time is there remaining on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 39 minutes remaining.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to correct some misinformation that got into the Record when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] was addressing the Committee. I asked for an explanation of the reduction in the item as it appears on page 14 of the report.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield, yes.

Mr. FENTON. I want to say that no misinformation was given the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. I differ with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I asked him, speaking of an item on page 14, general administrative expenses, about the cut in the appropriation and he said there

was no cut in that appropriation, yet the report indicates a cut of \$400,000 from the Bureau of the Budget estimate and \$450,000 below the appropriation for the same purpose last year.

Mr. FENTON. I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia that my answer was not with respect to that particular part he is pointing out now but was with respect to health and safety features. I did not have sufficient time to get to the second part of the gentleman's question.

Mr. BAILEY. So the gentleman agrees, then, that it had reference to the safety item in the Bureau of Mines and not to the general expenses of the Department.

Mr. FENTON. Let me get the gentleman straight. The budget estimate for the health and safety item was not cut at all. We gave them the \$5 million requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the health and safety item. What the gentleman is talking about is the administration expense.

Mr. BAILEY. Which I asked the gentleman about.

Mr. FENTON. I do not know about that. That cannot be connected with safety and health at all. That has to do with the regional offices.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak a word about the provision in reference to the Southwestern Power Administration. I know that the Southwestern Power Administration is going to be cut, it is being cut, but I just do not want it killed suddenly, as I think the provisions in this bill would kill it.

I know that there is a reorganization plan on the Secretary's desk at this time down there in the Interior Department, and, of course, I know, too, that Mr. McKay is not too enthusiastic about public power in any fashion.

Tomorrow I intend to offer an amendment increasing the \$275,000 in this bill by \$350,000 which would total \$625,000, and to delete the proviso at the bottom of the page. I think that is a reasonable thing to do. Unless that is done the administration of the Southwestern Power Administration is going to be reduced on the 1st of June to 86 people. It is utterly destructive to do it in this fashion.

I would think that the majority would agree to the deletion of this proviso at the bottom of the page because they should be willing to trust their own administration in the Department of the Interior. If that amendment can be adopted and orderly reorganization can go ahead, instead of just taking a meat ax and chopping this thing off on the 1st of June this year when they will not have enough people to police this thing much less have any additional construction, then this orderly process can go along and in December 1955, they will be down to the 86 people that the reorganization plan provides for. Of course, I am not for the reorganization plan, as far as that is concerned. I believe the Southwestern Power Administration ought to have some money on the side for further development, if ad-

ditional dams are built there and so forth, because it has been a wonderful administration and it has gotten along with the power companies in all that region. In Texas and in Oklahoma they have agreements with the power companies that the power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration have lived up to 100 percent. They each work with the other and they have brought about peace and harmony and good feeling in one section of the United States between the power companies and the Government operation.

So it would seem to me that would be a reasonable thing to do, and I hope that the amendment might be accepted by those in charge of the bill because if this thing is to be cut from two-hundred-some-odd employees down to 86 it should not and cannot be done under any businesslike methods between now and June 30 of this year. I just think it is using a meat ax instead of using a sharp knife. Of course, it does not make much difference to the fellow whether he is murdered or manslaughtered; but the penalty is not as much sometimes for the man who commits manslaughter as it is in the case of premeditated murder.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say that the gentleman from Texas and I have always agreed pretty well on things of this nature. May I say that the Department of the Interior sent a survey team down to the Southwestern Power area and made quite a thorough audit and investigation. They came back with the recommendation that the personnel be reduced to 86 people. The committee allowed sufficient funds to pay 100 people. In all fairness, I must say that Mr. Aandahl, former Member of Congress, whom we all know, and who is now Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of power, has looked the matter over again and has recommended in a letter to us that we allow \$200,000 more.

Mr. RAYBURN. Two hundred and thirty thousand dollars, is it not?

Mr. JENSEN. Two hundred thousand dollars, I believe.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thought it was raised to \$780,000. That would be \$230,000 more.

Mr. JENSEN. I have not seen the letter. The matter just came to my attention that he has asked for something in the neighborhood of \$200,000 more. Does the gentleman propose to offer an amendment for an additional \$230,000?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; \$350,000 to add to the \$275,000, and delete this proviso which says that you cannot spend more than \$250,000 on personal services.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman's proposed amendment is for what amount?

Mr. RAYBURN. To add to \$275,000 \$350,000, making \$625,000.

Mr. JENSEN. For what purpose?

Mr. RAYBURN. For the purpose of personnel, for paying the people their accumulated leave, and all this, that, and the other, and not knocking this thing down to 86 people or 100 people on the 30th of June this year. I do not

think that can be done without a very destructive operation resulting.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman can understand the position the committee was in when we marked up the bill, after reading the report that was made available to us through the Department of the Interior, to the effect that they recommend only 86 people.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman means for 1955?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I understand they have been pushed off of that stand. Somebody must have gotten hold of them and convinced them that the meat ax provision should be cut out.

Mr. JENSEN. That only came to our attention today. The letter from Mr. Aandahl only came to my attention today, and the committee has not had time to consider it yet.

Mr. RAYBURN. I hope the committee will take time to consider it between now and tomorrow so that we can get together on it.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill for Alaska.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may propound a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who we are all glad to have back here with us. The question relates, Mr. Chairman, to the committee report on page 10 which refers to certain funds which have been stricken from the Construction and Rehabilitation program of the Bureau of Reclamation with reference to the Trinity diversion of the Central Valley project. Is my understanding correct that although this money is taken out of this particular item, that is, the construction item, that is without prejudice and does not disturb the amount of \$100,000 which is in the justification for planning under General Investigation?

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right. I might say to the gentleman that, of course, he knows that this Trinity project was authorized by a finding of feasibility by the previous Secretary of the Interior in one of the later days of 1952. The project had never been authorized by the Congress. The committee has taken the position that we will appropriate no funds for starting construction of any projects where a finding of feasibility was made by the Secretary of the Interior, whether it be a past Secretary or the present Secretary.

Mr. ENGLE. I am aware of that.

Mr. JENSEN. The \$100,000 which we have left in the bill for investigation is sufficient to carry on the necessary investigations for this project and to bring the information to the respective committee of Congress, and let them work their will as to whether to authorize the project or not.

Mr. ENGLE. That is entirely agreeable to me. I wanted it clear that tak-

ing the money out of the construction item did not take it out of the item under general investigations. I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] very much, and I thank the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for yielding.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am happy to see the chairman of the committee, Mr. JENSEN, back on his feet and looking so hale and hearty.

As I said, this is an important bill for Alaska. Annually, it supplies much of the fuel, as it were, which is needed to power our public development program in the Territory. This year I fear the fuel line has become clogged. I am very much concerned with some of the very drastic cuts which have been made in the bill not only in respect to reductions from last year's appropriations, but reductions from the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget.

However, I do want to extend my most sincere thanks to the committee for having allowed \$91,250 to be used in the hospitalization of an additional 20 patients of the Alaska Native Service in the Sanitarium for the Tubercular at Seward, Alaska. This money will do a lot of good there.

Mr. Chairman, the amount recommended by the committee for road construction in Alaska represents a very drastic cut, and I am gravely concerned on account of it because some of our needed roads cannot be built with the amount included in the bill. I believe I heard the chairman of the committee, in explaining the bill, say that it represented a reduction of 12½ percent below the estimates of the budget. The reductions in the Alaska categories are much greater and amount to 25 percent. In the field of road construction that amount is 29 percent below the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and 61 percent below the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

In respect to Alaska public works, the reduction is on the order of 58 percent on a percentage basis. I had been very hopeful that the committee would allow the sum of money, substantially, which was asked by the Department of the Interior and was rejected by the Bureau of the Budget, which would have permitted an undertaking of about \$10 million in public works in the Territory of Alaska in the next fiscal year. Half of the appropriated money is paid back to the Federal Treasury.

The cities of Petersburg, Nenana, Juneau Independent School District, the city of Valdez, the city of Anchorage, and Seldovia had some worthwhile projects for which elections had been held, which had been generally approved and now are only awaiting the appropriations. The elimination of those amounts from the bill is going to impede the progress of our public-works program.

May I ask the chairman of the committee, since the amount for that work is intermingled in the entire appropriation, what sum is contemplated for investigation work by the Bureau of Reclamation in Alaska for the next fiscal year?

Mr. JENSEN. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the same amount as for the current year. I am mindful of the fact that the gentleman from Iowa started our Bureau of Reclamation work in the field of hydroelectric investigation some years ago, and I am hopeful that the day will soon arrive when we can start that on a worthwhile scale again so that those potentialities may be made actualities.

I am very pleased to note that an appropriation has been made, although not in the budget amount, for rehabilitation of the southern part of the Alaska Railroad. May I ask if there is a contemplation that the work will proceed until completed?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. Of course, we cannot bind the next Congress. What the committee did on the Alaska Railroad item from Seward to Portage was this: The budget request was for an amount of \$9 million, approximately.

Mr. BARTLETT. Eleven million nine hundred and ninety-four thousand dollars for both the docks and the railroad work.

Mr. JENSEN. But for the railroad it was approximately \$9 million.

Mr. BARTLETT. Nine million ninety-four thousand dollars.

Mr. JENSEN. The \$2,900,000 was for the dock at Seward.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. We allowed that amount in full. The item for the rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad from Seward to Portage, as I said before, was approximately \$9 million. The committee allowed half of that this year because we knew it would be impossible for the work to go forward fast enough to expend \$9 million within the fiscal year 1955. We were sure of that. So we thought it best to spread it over 2 years, and give them time to get their feet on the ground and keep the contractors that are there now who have done that kind of work on the other sections of the railroad.

Mr. BARTLETT. This is the first time, as I understand, that the committee has given its stamp of approval to the completion of the rehabilitation program by going clear down to Seward.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now may I ask the chairman about the Copper River Highway which will lead from Cordova to the Richardson Highway. The \$700,000 which is provided in the bill is not, as I understand, for extension of the work but merely to complete work already started. Is that right?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. There are some unexpended funds in that item for that road. We appropriated \$700,000 more to be spent in addition to the unexpended funds which were in the bill for 1954, this year.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the statement just made by Mr. JENSEN, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, in regard to the import of the language used in the committee report on page 10 with reference to funds for the Trinity division. It is not surprising in the light of the way this justification was sent up that there would be some confusion about it. On page 51 of part 1 of the Bureau of Reclamation's justifications, under the item for "General investigations," there is \$100,000 included for the Central Valley project, Trinity River division. On page 209 of part 4 of the justifications under the estimate for "Construction and rehabilitation," the Trinity Division is included for \$99,000. In the summarization of financial data for "Construction and rehabilitation," which appears on page 2 of the Bureau of Reclamation justifications, an item of \$100,000 for the Central Valley project is noted. In the light of all this, I was afraid that the language on page 10 of the report would preclude the use of any funds whatever for the Trinity River project for any purpose. My informal discussions with the committee members, however, made it clear that it was not the committee's intention to cut off the planning on the project. There is frequently a good deal of planning to be done even after a project has been found to be feasible, and certainly no such limitation is contemplated in the policy referred to by the committee in its report. I am therefore glad that Mr. JENSEN has made it perfectly plain that the \$100,000 in the Bureau of Reclamation justifications for general investigations remains intact for advanced planning on the Trinity division of the Central Valley project; and that the force and effect of the language on page 10 of the report is to strike down the reference to the Trinity River project under "Construction and Rehabilitation," and that alone.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in protecting the people in the Klamath River watershed, much of which is located in my congressional district. The Trinity River involved in the committee report is a tributary of the Klamath River. The Klamath River is one of the greatest fishing streams in the United States and attracts tourists from all parts of the country. Humboldt County, through which a part of the Klamath runs, is the second largest timber-producing county in the United States. The Klamath River flows through Del Norte County and empties into the Pacific Ocean. Del Norte County is a large timber-producing county.

There are facilities for taking care of the byproducts of the lumber industry in the manufacture of various wood byproducts. It is essential that a good supply of fresh water be available for the process of manufacture. The people in

the two coastal counties which would be affected by diversion of water from the Trinity River into the Central Valley of California, could be adversely affected if they did not have an adequate supply of water for future use.

I am not opposed to the \$100,000 which has been made available for survey money for this project. However, I was opposed to the \$99,000 for the Trinity Division which appeared under the item, "Schedule of construction program, fiscal year 1954-55, Central Valley project, California." Should such a fund be set up it might be termed as legislative approval of this project.

We are aware that this project was authorized by the former Secretary of the Interior in the latter part of 1952, and you will also recall that during the first session of the 83d Congress the House passed a bill that was sponsored by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee providing that any project costing in total \$5 million or more must be authorized by the Congress. I am in accord with that bill and believe it to be the responsibility of Congress to authorize such projects. The people in the watershed of the Klamath River desire to be assured that their present and future needs of water will be taken care of and that only excess water will be diverted from this stream.

When this project comes up for congressional action the people in the counties interested will have an opportunity to appear before the proper committees of the Congress to appraise them of their present needs and future requirements.

I am glad that the committee took recognition of this fact and desire to quote from their report their reasons for deleting \$99,000:

Central Valley project: Funds for the Trinity division, amounting to \$99,000 have been specifically deleted in arriving at the reduction applied to this project. In its report on the 1954 bill, the committee enunciated the general policy that it would not consider appropriations for any project not authorized by legislation and for which construction funds have not been previously appropriated. In general agreement with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, this policy will apply to all projects costing in total \$5 million or more. The Trinity River division, estimated to cost ultimately \$181,168,000, is a project of the type that the committee had in mind when the policy was adopted, since it was added to the Central Valley project only by a finding of feasibility by the former Secretary of the Interior in the latter part of 1952.

The committee has done a fine job, and I desire to compliment them.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should just like to question the decision that has been apparently made in reporting this bill to stop all purchases of steam energy from the Western Farmers' Electric Cooperative of Anadarko, Okla. I know that the members of the subcommittee and many Members of the whole House are quite familiar with the fact that the Western Farmers' Cooperative is a generation and transmission organization which sells wholesale power to REA distribution systems in Oklahoma.

Facilities of this generation co-op were specifically designed to operate in coordination with the hydro facilities of the Southwestern Power Administration.

At this point, I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] with reference to the Western Farmers' Electric Cooperative of Anadarko and the SPA. Is it not the understanding of the chairman of the subcommittee that the steam plant at Anadarko, Okla., was designed for operation in accordance with contracts between the Southwestern Power Administration and the cooperative whereby SPA would purchase large amounts of steam power from the cooperative for use in firming up the hydro system of the Government? And is it not the understanding of the chairman of the subcommittee that the original contract has been effectively suspended by the action of the Congress in failing to appropriate sufficient funds for carrying it out during fiscal year 1954?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. It was. But we did not believe in having the Federal Government or the private companies take over the business of the REA lock, stock, and barrel, and so we put a provision in the bill last year which would take care of that. And almost everybody except 1 or 2 people down in that section of the country that the gentleman knows about are well pleased with the situation as it is today.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is it not the understanding of the chairman of the subcommittee that the original contract has been effectively suspended by the action of the Congress in failing to appropriate sufficient funds for carrying it out during the fiscal year 1954?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. I just explained why—because we do not want the Federal Government to run the REA. I think this point should be brought out. At this point I should explain to the Members that contracts were entered into between the Southwestern Power Administration and the cooperatives several years ago which provided that after the REA's have paid off all the indebtedness the Southwestern Power Administration could then pay the REA's \$10 and they would own all power-producing facilities of the REA. Now, we do not go along with that kind of business, and I hope the gentleman does not go along with that kind of business.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to finish reading this, I would like to ask another question of the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I received a call from Henry Templeton, of Hollis, Okla., also a wire from Truman Green, Central Electric Cooperative, Jefferson City, Mo., and a personal call from Roy Boecher, of the REA at Kingfisher, Okla. It is my understanding that this action was taken by the Congress because of its displeasure with certain provisions of the contract to which the subcommittee and the administration were opposed.

Mr. JENSEN. I just explained what that was about.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. These provisions included Government operation of

the cooperative transmission facilities and an option to purchase certain portions of those transmission facilities at the end of the contract term.

These original contracts which were not in agreement with the convictions of certain Members of the Congress have been discontinued, and the Western Farmers' Cooperative is, in accordance with the instructions of the Senate report on the fiscal year 1954 Interior appropriations bill, now attempting to work out permanent power exchange agreements with the power company in its area. However, these permanent agreements take considerable time to work out; and if they were signed today, it would be impossible to make physical connections with the surrounding power companies for a year or so because of the difficulty in obtaining the necessary electrical equipment. For this reason, the Western Farmers' Cooperative is at the present time operating its system under a temporary contract with the Southwestern Power Administration, which replaces to some extent the contracts originally signed, but which are now suspended. Mr. Chairman, the Southwestern Power Administration is at the present time purchasing about 5 million kilowatt-hours of energy per month from the Western Farmers' system, and has been doing so, according to my information, since February. I emphasize that this agreement is in full force at the present time and there is every anticipation that it will be continued beyond the end of this fiscal year and through the next fiscal year, 1955. Based on this fact alone, it would take an authorization of \$360,000 for SPA to continue purchasing even this amount of energy from the Western Farmers' system during fiscal 1955.

Yet I see from the committee report on this bill and from page 122, part 1, of the House hearings that all that has been appropriated in connection with this agreement is \$15,000, which is to be paid to the Western system for wheeling Federal energy to one municipality and one Army air base. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why no funds were included in the bill for the continuation of the present agreement, which would, if carried through 1955, require \$360 million for the purchase of 60 million kilowatt-hours of energy from the Western system?

Mr. JENSEN. The Department of the Interior officials in charge of this project requested certain amounts to be allocated this year to the different sections of the Southwest power pool, both utilities and REA electric cooperatives.

As you will note in the justifications on page 11, we have allocated to the Oklahoma companies \$153,000; to other utility companies, \$150,000; M. & A. Electric Power, \$24,000; Central Power Cooperative, \$108,000; Western Farmers' Electrical Cooperatives, \$15,000, making a total of \$450,000.

Now, as the gentleman has just stated, negotiations are going on right now to determine the kind of agreement that is going to be made between the Interior Department and REA cooperatives.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I hope something can be worked out in the Senate that the gentleman can go along with.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, this committee had no information at all on which to base a higher amount for these functions. So if this agreement can be worked out in time before the Senate writes up its bill, of course whatever amount the Interior Department tells the Senate is necessary will be considered by the Congress. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That pretty well answers it.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, what do you mean "pretty well"?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I still think we will need at least \$360,000.

Mr. JENSEN. I must tell you that there is \$350,000 in this bill for customer connections.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I mean the Western Electric. We need \$360,000 to carry through 1955.

Mr. JENSEN. This committee cannot come before this House and recommend \$350,000 when we have nothing on which to base our action except a request for \$15,000. I think the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; I do not agree with it, because the Congress previously made the authorization.

Mr. JENSEN. But no one asked us for any more money up until this time. This is the first time it has been mentioned.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This was mentioned about a year ago. This matter came up on the floor of the House then.

Mr. JENSEN. It was not mentioned to the committee.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. At the time the SPA amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was voted down.

Mr. Chairman, the Western Farmers system has a tremendous investment in its generation and transmission facilities and has already suffered a severe financial setback by the setting aside of the original contract between the Government and the cooperative. It seems there has never been any complaint concerning the contract between the Oklahoma power companies and the Government, and over one-third of the total amount appropriated in the bill for power exchange between the Southwestern Power Administration and other power-producing organizations in the area is for payment to the Oklahoma power companies under their contract with the Government. It seems unbelievable to me it is now apparently proposed to cut off the Western Farmers Electric Cooperative completely, authorizing no funds whatsoever for the purchase of steam energy from their plant while simultaneously authorizing a relatively large sum to carry out the same purpose with private utility systems.

I would like to emphasize that SPA is purchasing 5 million kilowatt-hours of energy per month from the Western system and that there is every indication that this contract will be continued through fiscal 1955. I must say that I

am disappointed that the bill does not contain any funds for the purchase of energy from the Western Farmers Electric Cooperative during fiscal year 1955.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I feel a little like the farmer with 1 shotgun shell and 3 rabbits running in different directions, as I approach the problem of discussing this appropriation bill. There are three things about it that gravely disturb me. On the first one concerning the Southwestern Power Administration, I am pleased to hear that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is going to offer a corrective amendment.

To my way of thinking it would be deplorable at this stage of the proceedings in the development of rural electrification public power and industrial facilities in the Southwest to have the Southwest Power Administration cut down with a meataxe, as the gentleman from Texas said, by this appropriation proposal which is before us. I certainly hope that the membership will go along with the amendment when it is offered tomorrow by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

I was also very pleased to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] question the committee concerning the completely disproportionate cut which has taken place in the appropriation for the Bureau of Mines research work on petroleum and natural gas. It is entirely out of line with the cuts which have taken place in appropriations for experimental work of the Bureau of Mines in other fields. There can be no reasonable justification for it. Certainly it cannot be argued that the location of adequate reserves of petroleum and natural gas is no longer an important matter for this Government to be concerned with.

I have it on good authority that if this cut goes through a great deal of the important experimental work in the secondary recovery of oil being carried on by the Bureau of Mines is going to be stopped in its tracks. I know of one experimental station in the State of Oklahoma which will have to be shut down if this takes place, and it is carrying on one of the most important experiments in the secondary recovery of oil that has taken place in the whole Southwest.

I certainly hope that a corrective amendment will be offered to this part of the bill. If one is I know it will have the support of most of the Members from the Southwest who realize the importance of this experimental work.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have but a few minutes; I must decline to yield at this time.

As a final point, I would like to question the chairman of the committee briefly regarding language appearing on page 6 of the committee report dealing with health, education, and welfare service for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The

language to which I refer appears at the bottom of the page:

No reduction is to be made in the number of teachers, doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel required in the attendance of the sick.

Am I to conclude from that language that this committee has taken a stand against the closing of Indian hospitals throughout the United States which are so urgently needed by the Indian people?

Mr. JENSEN. I must answer the gentleman by saying that the language in the bill means exactly what it says. But I also would point out that the Bureau of Indian Affairs recommended the closing of a number of Indian hospitals; and the committee, naturally, did not appropriate for the hospitals which the Indian Service proposed to close.

The reason for closing those hospitals was that it was difficult to get good doctors, nurses, and surgeons, and that they could give the Indians much better hospitalization and surgery at other Indian hospitals or at regular general hospitals in the vicinity of the Indian reservations.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for his answer, but I would say in response to it that it is completely inconsistent to say, on the one hand, that you are going to permit them to close Indian hospitals because they do not have the medical and nursing personnel they need, and yet, on the other hand, to say that there shall be no reduction in the number of teachers, doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel required in the attendance of the sick; it is entirely inconsistent.

Mr. JENSEN. Not at all, because it is going to take all the nurses, doctors, and other medical personnel who are now attending the sick to take care of the remaining hospitals, including some other new ones, and the Indians needing treatment in them.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am sorry but I cannot yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 6 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Ohio 9.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my record will show that I have always been a staunch supporter of the rural-electrification program. I am a firm believer in this program, and I have always supported adequate appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. It is my hope that electricity will soon be made available to every farm home in the United States, through the facilities of the REA cooperatives and the private-power companies. There is no reason why the rural-electrification cooperatives and the producers of private power cannot work hand in hand to accomplish this. In fact, these two groups have been for several years and are at this time co-operating to make adequate electrical power available to the rural areas of my

congressional district. This is as it should be.

Now let me discuss for a moment a problem that presently confronts the REA cooperatives in the distribution of electrical power.

Under the RE Act many cooperatives formed what is known as generation and transmission cooperatives, commonly referred to as G. & T.'s. These cooperatives are made up of several rural distribution cooperatives as members. It is the function of the generation and transmission cooperatives to furnish and deliver electricity to the member cooperatives. The generation and transmission cooperatives generate a large part of their power—this is steam power, sometimes referred to as thermal power. They have one other source of power which is from the multipurpose dams. This is called hydro, or waterpower.

The agency of the Department of Interior which markets this hydro power to the generation and transmission cooperatives in the Southwest area is Southwest Power Administration, commonly referred to as SPA.

It is important to remember that hydro power must be integrated with steam power in order for marketing, so that the hydro power is used during those hours of the day when the load on the cooperative lines is the heaviest. That is the reason this hydro power from the dams is often referred to as peaking power. As peaking power it is less in cost than thermal power. It must also be remembered that this power must be transmitted to the small cooperatives before it is of any value to them as peaking power.

Five generation and transmission cooperatives are operating in Oklahoma and Missouri. They are Central Electric Cooperative; Northwestern Electric Cooperative in my congressional district and Kamo, and Show-Me, in Missouri; Kamo also operates in Oklahoma and Western is in Oklahoma.

These five generation and transmission cooperatives borrowed about \$75 million from REA to construct steam generating plants and to build transmission lines from the dams to carry the power which they would purchase from SPA.

Some time ago an agreement was made to lease these lines and generating plants to SPA in exchange for power. It was out of this controversy over the proposal that litigation developed between private power companies in Missouri and the generation and transmission cooperatives. Although it has been held in this litigation that the generation and transmission cooperatives do have authority under the Rural Electrification Act to carry out their operation and that SPA could legally lease the lines and plants, I understand that any such plan, including an option to purchase by SPA, has been abandoned by these generation and transmission cooperatives.

In order to integrate the power, both SPA power and private power, it is necessary for SPA to often use the transmission lines of the generation and transmission cooperatives and private power companies. In this way, SPA can market

its power to the best advantage of the Government and to preferred customers according to law. But in order to do this, SPA must pay for the use of the lines from appropriations made by the Congress. SPA cannot take the money it gets from its power and pay the debt to the generation and transmission cooperatives and private companies even though this could be done as an accounting transaction. Thus it is that money must be provided each fiscal year for this purpose or the entire integration and marketing breaks down. With this background in mind, let us now consider the specific problem at hand.

The five generation and transmission cooperatives have been negotiating with SPA and the private power companies in the area to complete the integrated system. Though there was money appropriated in this present fiscal year, the language in the report accompanying the bill last year forbade its use for such purposes. I understand that when the present Interior Department appropriation bill was considered in committee it was not known what sum would be needed by SPA for marketing purposes, consequently, this appropriation has been left out of this bill. If we do not provide funds for this purpose, the SPA power cannot be marketed to the member cooperatives, and the generation and transmission cooperatives cannot get the hydropower, cannot effectively load their lines in this integration effort, and the consumers dependent upon this source of power in the rural areas of the generation and transmission cooperatives will suffer a loss of power.

Therefore, Congress should appropriate funds for the SPA's use for marketing purposes during the interim period while these contracts are being negotiated and thereafter while the physical connections necessary to make possible the delivery of this power are being made.

I understand that permanent arrangements for the delivery of this power can be made within a year at the most, and after these permanent arrangements have been made there will be no need for the appropriation of additional funds for this purpose.

I further understand that it is estimated that approximately \$2 million is needed. Therefore, I earnestly urge that the Congress consider this matter and provide adequate funds for this purpose.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of our subcommittee, my good friend and very able colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], a few questions that were handed to me by Mr. Charles J. Fain, legislative assistant of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I think the gentleman touched on some of these questions in his discussion with the gentleman from Oklahoma, however, I would like to ask each one, if I may.

The first one is, Why are there no funds in this bill to cover payments for wheeling charges over the lines of the G. & T.'s—that is generation and transmission cooperatives?

Mr. JENSEN. The answer is there are funds in this bill for that purpose in the amount of \$147,000.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The second question, Why are there no funds for the purchase of steam power from the G. & T.'s to firm up the Government's hydropower being delivered to SPA customers?

Mr. JENSEN. For the very simple reason, and I answered that question when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] had the floor, that in last year's bill we denied funds for what they called the continuing fund which was used in conjunction with the contract that the Southwestern Power Administration had consummated with the G. & T.—that is, the generation and transmission co-ops in the Southwest area, which provided that after the 40-year payout period then the Southwestern Power Administration could pay the G. & T. \$10 and would take over then all the lines, the generating plants and steam plants, and they would be theirs.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That was the subject of litigation?

The JENSEN. The gentleman knows all about that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand they have abandoned those provisions or are going to.

Mr. JENSEN. As I said to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], this Committee, and I think the Congress generally speaking, have always insisted that the REA's be not taken over by anybody, that they are well able to run their own business.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. We of the Congress are strong for the REA's. They are a great outfit, they have done a good work, and we do not want the Southwestern Power Administration, the Department of the Interior or the private utilities to take them over. Now, that is the answer, and I would like to have anyone stand up here on the floor right now and tell us that they are not for that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The next question, Is it realized that the economic well-being of these G. & T.'s depends upon their ability to sell their excess steam to SPA?

Mr. JENSEN. No, that is not necessary at all. They intermingle their power and they sell it themselves, and by the intermingling of power with SPA, the private utilities, and the REA's, they get the benefit of that great power pool which the REA's will benefit by as well as SPA. The utilities will get the least benefit.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How much money will be needed in 1955 to pay these wheeling charges and purchase as steam power to the five generation and transmission cooperatives in the area?

Mr. JENSEN. We have no estimate on that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. None whatever.

Mr. JENSEN. No. They told us they needed \$350,000, and we gave it to them.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand that the G. & T.'s estimated the cost at about \$2 million.

Mr. JENSEN. That is just a guess.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. My next question is: Who can supply the proper figure to the Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. The Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Based upon past performance, these five generation and transmission cooperatives have estimated that approximately \$2 million will be needed for that purpose. Has any consideration been given to their estimates?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disturbed by the fact that the bill does not contain any funds whatsoever for the purchase of steam energy from the Central Electric Power Cooperative and the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative of Missouri. Like other generation and transmission cooperatives in the area which were built for the purpose of providing a low-cost source of wholesale energy for the REA's, the central and northwest systems were designed to operate in close coordination with the hydroelectric system of the Southwestern Power Administration. Northwest and Central have a very large investment in steam generating facilities and have constructed transmission lines from their steam plants to the Bull Shoals Dam for the purpose of integrating their systems with SPA hydrofacilities. These transmission lines are among the biggest in Missouri.

The Central and Northwest systems were specifically designed to operate in conformance with the contracts between the Government and the generation and transmission cooperatives. During the past several years, there has been much discussion in both Houses of the Congress concerning these contracts, and at the present time, they are in suspension because of the fact that the Congress did not appropriate sufficient funds to carry them out during fiscal 1954.

The Central Electric Cooperative as well as the Sho-Me Power Corp., the Northwest Electric Cooperative, and the Kamo Electric Cooperative, all of which operate in Missouri and all of which have firm contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration have suffered an enormous financial loss because of the suspension of the original contracts, and I might say that the resale rates of the Central system to member REA's have had to be increased in order to continue operation.

The Central and Northwest generation and transmission cooperatives are also, in accordance with the instructions of the Senate subcommittee of last year, attempting to work out permanent agreements with the power companies in their area but have been unable to do so thus far. At the present time, the Central system is operating under an interim agreement with SPA which in some measure at least replaces the original contract which is now under suspension. The interim contract contains

no lease-operate or option-to-purchase provisions. It is my understanding that for the last 3 months of the present fiscal year 1954, a combined interim contract including provisions for the integration of both the Northwest and Central systems with the SPA hydro facilities will be in force, and I think it is safe to say that some sort of interim agreement between the generation and transmission cooperatives of Missouri and SPA will certainly be in force during fiscal 1955.

These interim agreements generally provide for the payment of wheeling charges to the cooperatives by the Government for the use of their transmission facilities in delivering power to municipalities and other preference customers and for the purchase by SPA of steam power from the cooperatives for the purpose of firming up the Government hydroelectric capacity.

It is therefore rather shocking to realize that although the Government apparently intends to enter into agreements for the purchase of steam power from these cooperatives during fiscal 1955, there is not 1 cent of funds in the bill to pay for these purchases. I note from the hearings that \$107,640 is included in the bill for the payment of wheeling charges to the Central and Northwest electric generation and transmission cooperatives of Missouri, but there is not 1 cent in the bill to enable SPA to purchase steam energy from these 2 systems. I understand that an additional amount of \$1,278,000 will be required if the Government is to purchase during 1955 from the Central and Northwest generation and transmission cooperatives even the steam energy anticipated by present contract negotiations. These contracts would in no measure replace the original contracts which are now in suspension and would not provide for any funds to be paid for the lease operation of cooperative facilities or for an option to purchase these facilities at a later date.

It seems to me unthinkable that the subcommittee would report a bill which does not include any funds whatsoever for the purchase of energy from these generation and transmission cooperatives. The Government has signed contracts with them, has suspended the contracts, and has entered into new interim contracts. The chairman of the subcommittee should explain how he proposes that the Government should pay for such steam energy as it purchases from these cooperatives during fiscal 1955 if no funds are included in this bill for that purpose.

Any funds used by the Southwestern Power Administration for the purchase of steam energy are not appropriations in the true sense of the word because the energy purchased by the Government is not consumed, but is resold to other power distribution agencies for approximately the same price that is paid for it. It seems to me that, inasmuch as these cooperatives have \$75 million of REA loan funds invested in generation and transmission facilities, it is the duty of the Congress to take at least reasonable precautions to see that security of these loans is not jeopardized by our failure

to provide the minimum essential authorization for the purchase of steam energy during fiscal 1955.

The authorization will not be utilized unless the interim contracts are renewed for another year, and the money would revert to the Treasury. On the other hand, if the interim contracts are continued another year, as now seems almost certain, the money will certainly be needed in the worst sort of way.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, the distinguished chairman of this committee.

First I should like to express on behalf of myself, and I hope on behalf of all of the far western Members of this august body, the appreciation which I have, and I am sure they have, for the very real and genuine interest which has been evidenced by the members of this subcommittee over a great many years. I happen to be the only far westerner on the committee. We in the far West know of the importance of this bill to our area, and all of us sincerely appreciate the genuine interest in our portion of the United States which has in the past and I am sure in the future will again be evidenced by the members of this subcommittee.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I have two very brief questions.

Did the Fish and Wildlife Service request funds for the purchase of additional acreage to add to the Lake Pend Oreille game refuge in eastern Washington?

Mr. BUDGE. I recall no such request made by the Fish and Wildlife Service to the committee.

Mr. GUBSER. One more question. Is it true that the only land purchase programs currently in operation by the Fish and Wildlife Service are for additions to migratory bird refuges and the funds for such purposes come from the sale of migratory bird stamps to hunters?

Mr. BUDGE. That is my understanding. And, of course, those funds are not received into the Treasury for appropriation by this subcommittee and we have no control over them.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to advise the members of the Committee of the Whole House that one of the misunderstandings that very well could be encountered in an interpretation of this bill relates to the funds which previously have been appropriated directly to the Bureau of Reclamation for use in the Missouri River Basin. The Department proposed this year to make the appropriations direct to each individual agency for work in the Missouri River Basin. The committee, for the reason that it did not want the funds to lose their identities, did not agree with this proposal, and consequently adjustments have been made throughout

the bill in order to correct that situation as it was presented to us budgetwise.

In the main, the projects being carried out by the Department of the Interior will not be curtailed by the funds which have been allowed in this appropriation bill. The funds for construction in most instances are very near to or in excess of budget recommendations. Personnel reductions have been made and in some instances they were quite substantial. As an example of our justification for the action taken on some of the personnel items, this is one out of many dozens of instances. The National Park Service has approximately 100 people employed in the Yellowstone National Park during the summertime to take care of all the visitors to that park. At the same time the National Park Service has a regional office at Omaha employing about the same number of people to tell the people in Yellowstone National Park how to take care of their business. The committee has attempted in this bill to correct this type of operation in order that the field services may be strengthened, and where necessary, augmented.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I assume the gentleman knows that the dividends which the National Park Service pays into the Treasury are far and away beyond the cost of operation?

Mr. BUDGE. That is correct—

Mr. BAILEY. Well, that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. That is not the fact.

Mr. BAILEY. The revenues exceed the cost of operation, and have for years, as the gentleman will learn if he will take the trouble to check.

Mr. BUDGE. I think the gentleman is incorrect. No such representation has been made by the National Park Service.

Mr. BAILEY. I happen to have been involved in a survey of some school matters a few years ago and I took the trouble to find out, and that is the fact.

Mr. BUDGE. I should be happy to have the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] furnish his figures to the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I cannot understand why the gentleman hopes to effect savings and balance the budget by taking such action when this is revenue earned in the administration of the National Park Service.

Mr. BUDGE. Even if the money were earned, I see no reason why the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] should not join me and the other Members of Congress in an attempt to save a little bit of it. This should particularly be true when the committee attempts to reduce personnel in the regional office in order that the staff at Yellowstone may be kept intact, or if this committee had its way, increased by transfers from the regional office.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Reference was made a moment ago to the Bureau of Reclamation in the matter of a reduction in personnel. Could the gen-

tleman inform the House approximately what personnel may be reduced, as it pertains to the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. BUDGE. The personnel which we hope will be reduced—and, of course, over that we have no immediate control—is the administrative and the design personnel, so that we can get away from our present system of having approximately 25 percent of the total cost of the project assessed for the overhead items of administration and design. That is what we would like to get away from. We see no valid reason why the water users, the power users, and the taxpayers should foot the bill for what are obvious excesses in overhead. I personally feel that the past exorbitant expenses for design, supervision, and administration have done much to retard the reclamation program in recent years. It will continue to do so unless substantially reduced, which is what is proposed in this bill. Available funds should be spent on actual construction, not administration.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, in answer to my inquiry the committee staff has informed me that of the amount allowed to Fish and Wildlife Service, \$10,000 is to be used to continue the program for the control of blackbirds in New Jersey. This determination of the committee is set forth on page 16 of the committee report submitted April 1, 1954, by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], chairman.

The damage that has been done to growing crops by blackbirds in southern New Jersey has reached an amount that constitutes it one of the most serious problems with which the farmers in that section of New Jersey are faced. The amount that has been allowed by the committee for control is all too small, but it is better than nothing. It is sufficient to keep at least a part of the control program in operation.

A study and report on the extent of depredations to corn by blackbirds and associated species in portions of Salem, Cumberland, and Gloucester Counties, N. J., in 1953, was made by Charles W. Wright, of the New Jersey Fish and Game Commission. This report supplements a report that was made by Mr. Robert T. Mitchell, of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Over the past 10 years a noticeable increase has been reported in blackbirds in southern New Jersey and northern Delaware. This alleged increase may be the result of an upswing in blackbird populations of a translocation of birds into this area, due to increased acreages of sweet corn grown there. In more recent years blackbird damage has become alarmingly great both to ripening corn and sprouting small grain. To alleviate this situation, agricultural authorities and local farmers, some of whom represented farm organizations, formed a committee known as the Blackbird Control committee of the Delaware River

Valley. This committee obtained technical assistance of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the New Jersey Fish and Game Commission and sought special Federal funds to support an investigational program.

Cooperation rendered by farmers of and members of the blackbird control committee has been exceptional and permitted accomplishment of results far in excess of what might have been expected from the available financial resources. Many people and organizations cooperated in the work.

Special recognition should be given to Mr. George I. Ball, Salem County agent,

who served in a liaison capacity and devoted a considerable amount of professional and personal time during the summer to the blackbird problem. Mr. Ball deserves a great deal of credit from his constituents and fellow committee members, and gratitude of the United States and Wildlife Service and the New Jersey Fish and Game Commission has been expressed for his efforts. Also, for helpful counsel and guidance, and for assistance in planning the investigations undertaken, special acknowledgment is due to Mr. Johnson Neff, veteran biologist of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Surveys were made in Gloucester, Salem, and Cumberland Counties in New Jersey by Charles Wright, of the New Jersey State Fish and Game Commission, to determine extent of blackbird damage to both sweet and field corn. At the same time varieties, planting dates, distance of the fields from breeding and feeding grounds, and other features were observed to determine the relationship of these factors to damage.

In the making of these surveys attention was also given to the effect of different methods of control. The following tables of results in this respect are interesting:

TABLE I.—Comparison of blackbird damage in fields protected with rope firecrackers and neighboring unprotected fields

Protected					Unprotected				
Field No.	Locality	Acreage	Planting date	Percent ears damaged	Field No.	Locality	Acreage	Planting date	Percent ears damaged
F-2	Mannington Township, N. J.	20	May 25	17.7	U-20	Mannington Township, N. J.	16	May 25	22.7
F-4	Odessa, Del.	45	May 15	31.5	U-2	Odessa, Del.	38	May 15	63.0
F-5	do.	22	May 25	11.3	U-5	do.	20	May 25	17.5
F-6	do.	25	do.	8.4	U-5	do.	20	do.	17.5
F-11	Middletown, Del.	18	May 26	10.2	U-10	Middletown, Del.	18	do.	14.2
F-12	do.	45	May 29	8.9	U-10	do.	18	do.	14.2
F-15	Lower Alloways Creek Township, N. J.	16	June 13	16.4	U-28	Lower Alloways Creek Township, N. J.	16	June 15	62.5
F-25	Lower Penns Neck Township, N. J.	12	May 29	38.6	U-32	Lower Penns Neck Township, N. J.	7	May 31	58.1
F-26	do.	1	May 30	13.4	U-32	do.	7	do.	58.1
F-27	do.	5	do.	18.6	U-32	do.	7	do.	58.1
F-28	do.	4	do.	13.5	U-32	do.	7	do.	58.1
F-29	do.	16	May 31	21.2	U-32	do.	7	do.	58.1
F-32	do.	30	June 3	23.5	U-36	do.	4	June 4	98.2
F-35	do.	6	June 11	74.5	U-36	do.	4	do.	98.2

TABLE II.—Comparison of blackbird damage in rifle-protected corn with damage in neighboring unprotected fields

Treated					Untreated				
Field No.	Acreage	Location	Planting date	Percent ears damaged	Field No.	Acreage	Location	Planting date	Percent ears damaged
R-1	50	Odessa, Del.	May 15	9	U-2	38	Odessa, Del.	May 15	63
R-2	20	do.	do.	30	U-1	1	do.	do.	96
R-3	35	do.	do.	13	U-2	38	do.	do.	63
R-4	80	do.	do.	7	U-2	38	do.	do.	63
R-5	10	Elsinboro Township, N. J.	June 4	21	U-3	7	Elsinboro Township, N. J.	June 5	19

These tables are given to show the justification of expenditures for control measures. In the aggregate it means a considerable saving to the farmers involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; had come to no resolution thereon.

TUNA IMPORTS

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Look magazine there appeared an article entitled "Suicide by Tariff"? by Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board of the Studebaker Corp., which contained some reference to tuna imports.

The center of the tuna canning industry of the United States is located in my district. Consequently, I have made it a point to try to keep well-informed on the problems of the tuna industry and to see to it that the other Members of the House receive as much accurate information as possible about this important industry.

Mr. Hoffman occupies a very important position in public life today. He

has been a leader in industry and a high official in our Government.

Mr. Hoffman's article contained the following statement:

He was too polite to suggest that Japan's efforts to earn dollars by selling goods to us had met with one rebuff after another. When the Japanese tried to sell us tuna fish and other products, they bumped into insurmountable barriers set up by American businessmen.

American businessmen have done nothing of the sort. How could they? Let us be more specific, Mr. Hoffman, about what insurmountable barriers set up by what businessmen.

Had any American businessmen done the things Mr. Hoffman implies, the Department of Justice would have had them in jail long ago.

Nor has the United States Government done anything of the sort. It is true that the duty on canned tuna in oil increased on January 1, 1951, from 22½ percent—ad valorem—to 45 percent—ad valorem. This occurred because the duty had been reduced purely as a war-

time measure to encourage production of food, in a reciprocal trade agreement with Mexico, but reverted to its prewar level when for other reasons the trade agreement with Mexico was canceled with the consent of the United States.

The Japanese tuna industry prior to the war had not considered the 45 percent tariff an insurmountable obstacle, nor would it consider the tariff excessive today if it had not found another means of getting canned tuna into the United States at a ridiculously low rate of duty.

The following figures will illustrate very graphically how little effect this rate of duty has had on imports of Japanese canned tuna in oil. During the war years there were, of course, no imports from Japan.

Tuna, canned in oil—Imports from Japan

Year	Imports	
	Pounds	Value
1931.....	648,900	\$127,461
1932.....	5,070,620	652,686
1933.....	14,219,206	1,949,649
1934.....	7,567,701	1,203,932
1935.....	7,112,638	1,157,877
1936.....	5,865,923	1,007,080
1937.....	9,802,467	1,913,424
1938.....	4,872,417	950,617
1939.....	7,764,000	1,314,000
1940.....	5,537,672	958,046
1941.....		
1942.....		
1943.....		
1944.....	210	189
1945.....	645,423	417,923
1946.....	1,871,576	883,742
1947.....	31,809,259	12,757,387
1948.....	2,456,747	1,021,495
1949.....	4,204,248	1,683,821
1950.....	4,088,658	1,733,011

But the Japanese have cleverly found a way of evading either the 22½ percent tariff or the 45 percent tariff. By the simple expedient of leaving out the oil and adding instead water and salt, the Japanese—and other foreign tuna producers—have discovered that the rate of duty to be assessed is only 12½ percent. Let us take a look then at imports of tuna canned in brine—water and salt—and see what resorting to this subterfuge has effected by way of increased imports:

Tuna, canned in brine, imports from Japan

Year	Imports	
	Pounds	Value
1948.....	11,250	\$2,500
1949.....	73,235	22,503
1950.....	8,627,091	2,919,894
1951.....	18,573,070	6,751,221
1952.....	28,393,310	11,644,345
1953.....		

Total imports all tuna from Japan (in oil or in brine)

Year:	Pounds
1949.....	1,792,846
1950.....	31,882,494
1951.....	11,084,091
1952.....	22,861,517
1953.....	33,080,554

When we add together the total imports of all canned tuna, whether in oil or in brine, note how that compares with prewar imports.

Do these figures indicate the placing of insurmountable barriers in the path of the Japanese tuna industry?

Now, what is the story with regard to imports of frozen tuna? This product

is now and always has been entirely free of duty and note how these imports have risen.

Frozen tuna imports from Japan

Year	Quantity (thousand pounds)	Value (thousands)
1931.....	6,812	\$530
1932.....	4,295	271
1933.....	4,497	179
1934.....	5,733	396
1935.....	5,688	386
1936.....	4,676	274
1937.....	11,046	665
1938.....	4,449	275
1939.....	5,202	328
1940.....	1,521	132
1941.....	2,392	536
1942.....	2,839	442
1943.....	25,369	4,000
1944.....	35,727	5,204
1945.....	50,985	7,305
1946.....	77,362	12,439

Do these figures show that any insurmountable barriers exist?

The true situation is that our domestic tuna industry has been suffering ever increasing difficulties since the end of the war that cannot by any stretch of the imagination be attributed to anything except competition from cheap imports.

Tuna consumption in the United States has been increasing steadily. Tuna production in the United States has been rising to meet this increased demand—a demand that has been generated entirely by the efforts of the domestic industry which has spent millions of dollars in advertising while the Japanese industry has spent not one dime. But as will be readily apparent, the share of the United States market enjoyed by domestic producers has been going down steadily.

Does this indicate any insurmountable barrier to imports? Mr. Hoffman just does not know the facts.

What then, Mr. Speaker, are the facts?

The facts are that the only obstacles to imports of tuna to the United States are those imposed by the Japanese Government of its own volition. Since the Japanese Government has been much more responsive to the desires of its tuna industry than our Government has been to the requests of our tuna industry, it is obvious that such obstacles as have been imposed by the Japanese Government have been imposed at the request of the Japanese industry itself.

In other words, the Japanese gentleman referred to by Mr. Hoffman was not as Mr. Hoffman expresses it, "too polite," he was simply being honest.

In the last half of 1950, imports of Japanese canned tuna were so overwhelming that all through 1951 all parts of the distributive system were swamped in the flood. The canners' warehouses were full, the wholesale distributors had tremendous sums tied up in inventory, the importers had bulging warehouses. Yes, even the consumers' pantry shelves were overloaded. In the summer of 1951, representatives of the southern California fishing fleet came to me for help. They told me that the entire fleet was tied up at the docks in San Pedro and in San Diego; that no tuna vessel dared venture to sea for a load of fish because if it did so there was no assurance that when it returned it would be able to

sell its catch to any cannery because of the terrific inventory position.

Because of the plight of these fishermen, I introduced a bill to afford some protection against these imports of tuna. That bill was considered by a special subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], of the Committee on Ways and Means. As a part of its consideration, the special subcommittee received testimony from the Tariff Commission, the Department of the Interior, and the State Department. At that time, everyone was agreed that some action was necessary. The subcommittee so reported to the full committee and the full committee, in turn, submitted a modification of my bill to the House which was passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, this was the first time in 20-odd years that a bill had passed the House proposing an increase in tariffs. The bill, however, did not pass the Senate and consequently no tariff was imposed on frozen tuna.

Was this one of the insurmountable barriers referred to by Mr. Hoffman?

The tuna canning industry, because of its problem of seriously increased competition from Japanese canned tuna, then petitioned the Tariff Commission for action under the escape-clause provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This petition likewise failed of success because the Tariff Commission, by a 3 to 2 vote, held that imports of tuna canned in brine were not injuring the domestic industry which packs principally tuna canned in oil.

Was this also an insurmountable barrier?

The Senate Committee on Finance ordered the Tariff Commission to make a still further investigation of the problems of the domestic tuna industry; and the Senators representing the three Pacific Coast States requested the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to make another investigation. While both investigations indicated that some protection for the domestic industry might be required, there has as yet been no action by any agency of the Government to diminish the flow of tuna imports from Japan.

Were these two investigations insurmountable barriers?

The Japanese Government, on the other hand, recognized that some of the actions taken by the Japanese industry were harmful to the program of merchandising tuna in the United States. The Japanese Government, therefore, took some action. In the first place, it continued in effect the requirement that all exports of tuna in any form from Japan would require export licenses. It next publicly announced the imposition of export quotas on shipments of frozen tuna and on shipments of canned tuna. These quotas were reasonable and represented quantities of tuna which could reasonably have been absorbed by the United States market without completely destroying the American tuna industry.

The Japanese Government went even further. It next established a system of check prices, or floor prices, which the

Japanese Government believed would, when the cost of freight, insurance, and duty was added, result in a price in the United States market more nearly comparable to the price at which domestically produced tuna is sold. Again, the Japanese Government took a further step with regard to frozen tuna. It required exporters to obtain from the canners in the United States certificates that the tuna was needed because supplies were not available from any other source and that the prices paid were comparable to the prices which United States producers were paying to American fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, these then are the unsurmountable barriers placed in the way of the Japanese tuna industry, but were they actually insurmountable barriers? The figures I have given previously are the answers to that. They certainly were not.

I will not go into detail at this time, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that even these barriers have been progressively relaxed as the likelihood that the Congress would take any action to protect the domestic industry diminished. Nor will I even dwell in detail on the evasions of the "check price" system practiced by the Japanese exporters and which have become well known to our own Bureau of Customs.

I would like, however, for the benefit of the members of the House, and also I hope, for Mr. Hoffman's benefit, to tell you something about present conditions in our own tuna industry. In spite of the fact that production in 1953 was at record levels, two of the oldest companies in the business have been taken over by other companies in recent months and the canneries shut down. A third was gone completely bankrupt and was sold by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at public auction on March 5. The workers in these canneries must now seek other jobs—if they can find any.

As far as the condition of the fishermen is concerned, I need only point out that construction of not a single vessel has been started in nearly 3 years and there is little likelihood that any will be started at any time soon. Instead, because of decreased income, owners of the present fleet of fishing vessels have skimped on maintenance and repairs, with the result that somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 vessels have been lost to the fleet by sinkings, fires, and other accidents within the past 2 years. Every time a vessel goes down, competent fishermen who have made this hazardous occupation their life's work are put on the beach.

WARRANT OFFICER ACT OF 1954

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6374) to revise certain laws relating to warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I assume there will be an explanation of the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me state to the gentleman I shall be pleased to give an explanation of the bill. It is a bill that came from the Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous report.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 6374, is a long overdue effort to establish a statutory career program for all warrant officers of the Armed Forces.

Like all personnel legislation, the bill appears to be complicated, but basically the principles are simple, the objectives are sound, and, I am happy to say, no increased budgetary requirements will be necessary as a result of enactment of the proposed legislation.

Warrant officers are as old as the Republic. As a matter of fact, they date back to the founding of the Navy, as they do in the Coast Guard when it was known as the Revenue Cutter Service. The Marine Corps adopted a warrant officer system in 1916, the Army in 1921. The Air Force has had warrant officers since they became a separate military department.

In many ways, it may be said that a warrant officer grade is normally the highest objective to which an enlisted man can aspire. We all know that many qualified enlisted men go on to commissioned grades, but not all enlisted personnel have the full qualifications deemed necessary for commissioned grades. At the same time many enlisted men demonstrate marked ability in certain military fields. These are the enlisted men who become warrant officers, and specialists in their fields. They are an essential, almost indispensable, part of our military system. For years, however, there have been wide discrepancies in promotional opportunities and in retirement privileges for the various warrant officers throughout the Armed Forces. Thus, a warrant officer in the Navy and Marine Corps under present law must complete 6 years of service in grade as a warrant officer before being eligible for promotion to commissioned warrant officer. In the Army and Air Force a warrant officer, junior grade, must complete 10 years of service in grade to be eligible for promotion to chief warrant officer. And in the Army and Air Force, chief warrant officers have only been authorized since 1941.

In addition, in the Army and Air Force, under existing law, only 40 percent of the Regular warrant officers may be promoted to chief warrant officer.

Now what this bill does is to establish a uniform system of promotion which will equalize opportunities for promotion throughout the Armed Forces.

You will recall that we established four pay grades for warrant officers in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Unfortunately, we did not at that time establish military grades. So in a sense the services have had to improvise with respect to these four pay grades since 1949. They have been able to accomplish their objectives through the use of temporary promotions, but insofar as permanent promotion is concerned they have not been able to make use of the pay grades since there are only two offi-

cial military grades in the Army and Air Force.

So this bill makes these four pay grades military grades and further provides that after 3 years in grade as W-1, warrant officers will be eligible for promotion to W-2; after 6 years as a W-2, warrant officers will be eligible for promotion to W-3; and after 6 years in grade as a W-3, warrant officers will be eligible for promotion to W-4.

But let me say here and now that this bill is not topheavy with benefits, because it also includes certain liabilities. And the one great liability to which every warrant officer will be now exposed is that of competition for promotion, together with the inevitable forced attrition. In other words, the proposed legislation will do for warrant officers what the Officer Personnel Act does for commissioned officers: it establishes a selection system but with the penalty of forced separation or retirement upon the failure of selection. This is a sacrifice which all warrant officers are willing to accept in exchange for this career program. Warrant officers have long wanted a definite promotion program established by law and they are willing to expose themselves to the penalty of forced attrition because of failure of selection in exchange for this statutory program.

Finally, the bill establishes a uniform retirement system. Under the proposed legislation, all warrant officers—Regulars, reservists on active duty, and temporary warrant officers on active duty—will be eligible to apply for retirement after 20 years of active service. This does not mean that their request must be granted, but at least they will have the privilege of applying for retirement in a manner comparable to that which now applies to Regular commissioned officers.

Today warrant officers in the Navy and Marine Corps must complete 30 years of service in order to apply for retirement; and while commissioned warrant officers of the Navy and Marine Corps can apply for retirement after 20 years of service, they can only do so if they have had 10 years of commissioned service. In the Army and Air Force, warrant officers today may apply for retirement in their permanent grade after 20 years of service, but they may only be advanced to the highest grade satisfactorily served during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, and then only after the completion of 30 years of service, including service in the Reserve.

The proposed legislation wipes out these discrepancies which have existed in law for retirement and establishes an overall uniform retirement system.

Finally, I want to say that the proposed legislation has been amended by the committee with respect to certain reserve warrant officers. Under the committee amendment, reserve warrant officers who now hold such warrants may, at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, remain in the reserve until age 64 in the Army and Air Force, and until age 62 in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, in order to complete the 20 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for retirement under

title III of Public Law 810, the so-called Reserve Retirement Act. This will protect the Reserve warrant officer who cannot attain 20 years of satisfactory Federal service upon attaining the age of 60. It only applies to those who now hold warrants. All other warrant officers—Regular, Reserve, or temporary—will be separated or retired upon attaining the age of 60 except the present Regular warrant officer or Reserve warrant officer who cannot complete 20 years of service in order to qualify for the retirement which is applicable in his particular case.

Mr. Speaker, this, in general, explains the proposed legislation and I hope that it will receive the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the Air Force is included in this warrant officer promotion deal?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And that those in the Air Force will get the same consideration as those in the Army and the other branches of the service?

Mr. ARENDS. They surely will.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Is the gentleman aware of the complaint that has been made by the members of the ROTC Air Force who were promised that if they would go through the program that upon graduation, they would receive a commission in the Reserve and that later the Air Force refused to grant it to those students who are graduating this June? Are you familiar with that?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, we are familiar with it. Let me say that this merely applies to warrant officers and not these others to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That leads me to my next question, if the gentleman will permit me. Your legislation here applies to warrant officers. I wonder what assurance our men will have, who are now in the Air Force, or who may enlist in the future, depending on this law for their permanent status and permanent retirement privileges. Somebody may say to them as the Air Force said to those who are now in the ROTC Air Force, "We cannot go through with the program because Congress did not give us the money." What assurance can the gentleman give the House that this program will be carried out, and not be bungled as they have bungled it with these students who went through the ROTC Air Force program.

Mr. ARENDS. Of course, I must say to the gentleman we cannot assure them the money, but I hope if we write this piece of legislation into law, then naturally it would follow that they will get the money to complete the program, as we want it to be. I think we should have no fear about that particular angle of the matter, that the gentleman is worried about.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. With regard to this point which has been brought up, the

assurance will be, if this becomes law, it will be required that these things be done. Therefore, you will then not have the situation to which the gentleman from Colorado refers where the ROTC students were not protected. If this bill becomes law, these men will be protected by the provision of the law. It will prevent exactly the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I understand from representations which have been made to me that beginning in the year 1950, the Air Force and the Army, and other branches of the service through the ROTC program asked the students to join them in the national defense effort, and outlined to them what the program was in the future. Many went into the Army and many went into the Air Force. I understand the Army is giving those students their commissions in the Reserves, but the Air Force is not. Is there any legislation pending before the Armed Services Committee to compel the Air Force to fulfill their contract with these young men?

Mr. ARENDS. There is no such proposal before our committee at the present time that I know of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the representation made by the Air Force, in view of the fact that there are thousands of students who joined the Air Force ROTC who were told that they would get a commission at the end of 4 years when they finished training, that the Armed Services Committee should at least make some effort to see that the Air Force carry out the contract which they made with the young men who in good faith entered into this obligation with them 4 years ago, while the Army itself is granting commissions and the Air Force is not.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree that there should not be the situation which we now find in the Air Force, of young men who entered into a contract to serve in the ROTC and upon graduation serve in a commissioned status for a minimum of 3 years. It is a situation which I hope will be ironed out and corrected. There is another thing involved, not only the question of what the Department has done, but at the time the young men who are now graduating were taken into the ROTC there was a firm commitment by the Congress of the United States that we were going ahead with the program to expand the wings of the Air Force to 143. About this time last year, or a little later, the budget for the Air Force came before the Congress, and they were cut back from 143 to 120. It is anticipated that this year they are going to be permitted to go up to 137. So that the responsibility is not entirely on the part of the Air Force. The Congress itself must take its portion of the responsibility, because we sustained budget cuts in the Air Force last year and cut them back to 120 wings. We are now going up to 137, and I hope that in a short period it will be possible to place

the young men who were taken in under expectation that we would have a larger Air Force than it turned out to be will be commissioned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask my friend in his revision to make one correction. A majority of the Members of Congress voted for this cut last year. I know that I voted against it, and I am sure the gentleman did. President Truman recommended 143 air wings, and a reduction was made as a matter of policy by the present administration. Now, back to 137 air wing groups, which confirms the position taken by President Truman and by the Democrats, because if they were right today they were wrong several months ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Warrant Officer Act of 1953."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Secretary," unless otherwise qualified, means the Secretary of the Army, with respect to the Army; the Secretary of the Navy, with respect to the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force, with respect to the Air Force; and the Secretary of the Treasury, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Treasury Department.

(b) The term "warrant officer," unless otherwise qualified, means an officer who holds a warrant or a commission in a warrant officer grade in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, including any component thereof.

(c) The term "date of a failure of selection for promotion" unless otherwise qualified, is that date on which the Secretary approves the report of the board under section 10 (b) of this act, or the date upon which the name of the officer concerned is removed from a recommended list under section 10 (c) of this act, or the date prescribed by the Secretary under section 12 of this act, as appropriate.

(d) The term "active service" means active service as defined in section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GRADES OF WARRANT OFFICERS

SEC. 3. (a) Warrant officer grades, as prescribed in the following table, are hereby established in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. These warrant officer grades shall correspond to the various pay grades prescribed for warrant officers by section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802, 806), as amended, in accordance with the following table:

Warrant officer grades	Pay grades
Chief warrant officer, W-4	W-4
Chief warrant officer, W-3	W-3
Chief warrant officer, W-2	W-2
Warrant officer, W-1	W-1

Chief warrant officers, W-4, W-3, and W-2, shall be persons warranted in those grades in the Army or Air Force, and persons commissioned in those grades in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; warrant officers, W-1, shall be persons warranted in that grade. A warrant officer of any one warrant officer grade shall have precedence over all

warrant officers of warrant officer grades of lower numerical designation.

(b) The appointment of a permanent warrant officer to higher temporary warrant or any commissioned officer grade shall not operate to vacate his permanent warrant officer grade, nor shall it in any way prejudice any right, privilege, benefit, or promotion status to which he may be entitled by virtue of his permanent warrant officer grade.

REDESIGNATION AND REDISTRIBUTION OF WARRANT OFFICERS

SEC. 4. (a) Warrant officers (including warrant officers who on the effective date of this act are in receipt of or entitled to retired pay or retirement pay or are on the temporary disability retired list) shall, effective upon the effective date of this act, be distributed among the grades established by section 3 of this act as the Secretary may prescribe, and at any time prior to the first day of the second month after the effective date of this act, the Secretary is authorized to redistribute these warrant officers. Upon such distribution or redistribution, each such warrant officer shall, without further action, hold the grade in which distributed or redistributed. In this distribution and redistribution—

(1) no such warrant officer shall receive a lower permanent warrant officer grade than the one which corresponds to the warrant officer pay grade to which his status as a permanent warrant officer entitled him on the day before the effective date of this act;

(2) no such warrant officer shall receive a lower temporary warrant officer grade than the one which corresponds to the highest warrant officer pay grade to which his status entitled him on the day before the effective date of this act; and

(3) a warrant officer who is entitled to retired pay or retirement pay or who is on a temporary disability retirement list shall receive the warrant officer grade which corresponds to the warrant officer pay grade in which he is receiving retired pay, retirement pay, or physical disability retirement pay, and such distribution and redistribution shall not serve to increase or decrease the amount of such pay or any higher commissioned officer rank or grade to which he is entitled on the day before the effective date of this act.

(b) Each permanent warrant officer of the Regular service shall, for promotion purposes, be credited in the permanent warrant officer grade in which distributed or redistributed under this section with such service as the Secretary shall prescribe, but not less than the active service performed as a permanent warrant officer after September 30, 1949, in the pay grade corresponding to the permanent warrant officer grade in which distributed or redistributed, including active service in any higher pay grade as a warrant officer or in any commissioned officer grade while his status as a permanent warrant officer entitled him to the pay grade corresponding to such permanent warrant officer grade.

APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) Appointments to any permanent warrant officer grade in the Regular service accomplished by a commission shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Other appointments to warrant officer grades shall be made by the Secretary.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this act, warrant officers appointed in the Regular service under this section shall be credited with such service for promotion purposes as the Secretary may prescribe, but not more than the period of active service actually performed in the grade, or the pay grade corresponding to the grade, in which appointed or in a higher warrant officer or commissioned grade or pay grade, while holding a temporary or permanent appointment.

AUTHORITY FOR TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 6. The Secretary may, in his discretion, terminate the appointment of a permanent warrant officer in the Regular service at any time within 3 years after the date of acceptance of his initial appointment as a permanent warrant officer of the Regular service. A warrant officer whose appointment is terminated under this section shall not be entitled to severance pay, but, upon his application he may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be enlisted in such grade as the Secretary may direct but not lower than the grade held immediately prior to appointment as warrant officer.

PROMOTION OF WARRANT OFFICERS

SEC. 7. The promotion of permanent warrant officers of the Regular service to a higher permanent warrant officer grade shall be governed by this act and such regulations concerning physical, moral, and professional qualifications as the Secretary may prescribe. The physical standards for promotion shall be the same as those which may be prescribed for retention on active duty. The permanent promotion of warrant officers other than permanent warrant officers of the Regular service and all temporary promotions to warrant officer grades shall be governed by such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

SELECTION BOARDS

SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Secretary determines that the needs of the service require, but not less than once annually, he shall appoint 1 or more boards of not less than 5 Regular officers of the service concerned for the selection of permanent warrant officers of the Regular service for promotion. No officer shall be eligible for membership on these selection boards if he has a permanent grade below that of lieutenant colonel or commander. When the second of two consecutive selection boards is to consider any of the warrant officers who were considered by the first board, no officer who served on the first board shall be eligible for membership on the second board.

(b) All other matters relating to the functions and duties of the boards, including the number of members required to constitute a quorum, shall be prescribed by the Secretary.

ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION

SEC. 9. (a) Each permanent warrant officer of the Regular service shall be considered by a selection board as prescribed by the Secretary sufficiently in advance of the date on which he completes the service in permanent warrant officer grade in the Regular service prescribed in this section (including service credited in that permanent warrant officer grade in the Regular service under section 4 (b) or 5 (b) of this act and service performed after the effective date of this act while he holds that permanent warrant officer grade in the Regular service) so that he may, subject to the provisions of this act, be promoted to the next higher permanent warrant officer grade in the Regular service as of the day after the date on which he completes the following service in grade—

- (1) warrant officer, W-1, 3 years;
- (2) chief warrant officer, W-2, 6 years; and
- (3) chief warrant officer, W-3, 6 years.

(b) A permanent warrant officer of the Regular service who is considered by a selection board for promotion, but who fails to be selected for promotion to the next higher permanent grade in the regular service, shall be considered for promotion by each later selection board which considers permanent warrant officers in his grade until he is retired, separated, or selected for promotion to that grade.

SELECTION FOR PROMOTION

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary shall furnish each selection board with the names of all

permanent warrant officers of the regular service, in order of seniority in their permanent warrant officer grade, who are eligible under subsections (a) and (b) of section 9 of this act, for consideration by that selection board for promotion to the next higher permanent warrant officer grade in the regular service—

(1) from the list of warrant officers, W-1, which the Secretary has submitted to it, each selection board shall select those warrant officers, W-1, whom the selection board considers fully qualified for promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, and shall also report the names of those warrant officers, W-1, whom it recommends for termination of their appointment under section 6 of this act; and

(2) from the list of chief warrant officers, W-2, and chief warrant officers, W-3, which the Secretary has submitted to it, each selection board shall select for promotion to chief warrant officer, W-3, and chief warrant officer, W-4, respectively, those officers whom it considers best qualified for promotion, in numbers not exceeding the number prescribed by the Secretary. The number prescribed by the Secretary for each of these chief warrant officer grades shall be equal to not less than 80 percent of the number of warrant officers who for the first time are being considered for promotion to each of those chief warrant officer grades under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 9 (a) of this act. Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the selection board shall also report the names of those chief warrant officers among those eligible for consideration whose reports and records in its opinion indicate their unfitness or unsatisfactory performance of duty in their present grades. The case of a warrant officer so reported shall be governed by section 15 of this act.

(b) The names of warrant officers who are selected for promotion shall be arranged in the report of the board in the order of their seniority in permanent warrant officer grade. The report of the selection board shall be submitted to the Secretary for his approval or disapproval in whole or in part.

(c) If prior to his appointment to the next higher grade the promotion of a warrant officer be disapproved by the Secretary, the President, or the Senate his name shall be removed from the list of officers who were selected for promotion by that board and his case shall be governed by section 11 (c) of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPOINTMENT ON PROMOTION

SEC. 11. (a) A permanent warrant officer of the Regular service who has been selected for promotion to the next higher permanent warrant officer grade by the first selection board which considered him for promotion to that grade, and who has met such qualifications as the Secretary may have prescribed under section 7 of this act, shall be appointed to that higher permanent warrant officer grade. The date of his appointment thereto shall be the day after the date he completes the service prescribed in section 9 (a) of this act.

(b) A permanent warrant officer of the Regular service who has previously failed of selection for promotion to the next higher permanent warrant officer grade, but who has been selected for promotion to that grade by a later selection board and has met such qualifications as the Secretary may have prescribed under section 7 of this act, shall be appointed to that higher permanent warrant officer grade. The date of his appointment thereto shall be one of the following dates, whichever is the earlier—

(1) that date which is 1 year after the date upon which such appointment would have been effective had he been selected for promotion by the last selection board which failed to select him; or

(2) the earliest date on which any warrant officer who has not so failed of selection and

whose name follows his on the list submitted to the Secretary under section 10 (b) of this act, is promoted to such higher grade.

(c) A permanent warrant officer of the regular service whose name, in accordance with section 10 (c) of this act, has been removed from the list of officers who are selected for promotion shall continue to be eligible for consideration for promotion and—

(1) if the next ensuing selection board recommends such a warrant officer for promotion, his name, without prejudice by reason of its having been removed therefrom, shall be replaced on the list from which it was removed. When he is promoted, the date of his appointment shall be the same as if his name had not been so removed; but

(2) if such warrant officer is not selected for promotion by the next ensuing selection board, or if his name, in accordance with section 10 (c) of this act, is again removed from the list of officers who are selected for promotion by the next ensuing selection board, his case shall be governed by section 13 of this act as if he had twice failed of selection for promotion.

FAILURE TO MEET MORAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 12. A permanent warrant officer of the regular service who has been selected for promotion to the next higher grade, but who, within such time as may be prescribed by the Secretary, fails to meet such moral and professional qualifications as the Secretary may have prescribed under section 7 of this act, shall not be appointed to that higher grade and his case shall be governed by section 13 of this act as if he had twice failed of selection for promotion.

FAILURE OF SELECTION FOR PROMOTION

SEC. 13. (a) Unless otherwise retired or separated under any law, each permanent warrant officer of the regular service who has twice failed of selection for promotion to the next higher permanent warrant officer grade under this act, shall—

(1) if on the date of his second failure of selection for promotion he has completed less than 18 years of active service, have his appointment as a permanent warrant officer in the regular service terminated and be separated on that date which is 60 days after the date of his second failure of selection for promotion, and be entitled to severance pay under section 16 of this act, unless—

(A) in lieu of severance pay, upon his application and in the discretion of the Secretary, he is enlisted in such grade as the Secretary may direct, or

(B) in lieu of severance pay, if serving on active duty as a commissioned officer, he elects, with the consent of the Secretary, to remain on active duty in his officer status;

(2) if on the date of his second failure of selection for promotion he has completed not less than 18 nor more than 20 years' active service, be retired on that date which is 60 days after the date on which he completes 20 years' active service, if he has not by that time been selected for promotion to the next higher grade, and be entitled to retired pay under section 14 (d) of this act; or

(3) if on the date of his second failure of selection for promotion he has completed more than 20 years' active service, be retired on that date which is 60 days after the date of his second failure of selection and be entitled to retired pay under section 14 (d) of this act.

(b) Retirement under clause (2) or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, may, in the discretion of the Secretary in the case of a permanent warrant officer who is serving on active duty as a commissioned officer and elects to remain on active duty as a commissioned officer, be deferred until such date as the Secretary may prescribe.

(c) Upon retirement or separation under subsection (a) of this section, any permanent warrant officer who holds a commission as an officer shall have that commission re-

voked on the date of such retirement or separation.

RETIREMENT OF WARRANT OFFICERS

SEC. 14. (a) Any warrant officer who has completed not less than 20 years' active service may, upon application and in the discretion of the Secretary, be retired and shall be entitled to receive retired pay computed under subsection (d) of this section.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection, any permanent warrant officer of the regular service who, having completed not less than 20 years of active service, has attained the age of 60, shall be retired on that date which is 60 days after the date on which he attains that age and shall be entitled to receive retired pay computed under subsection (d) of this section—

(1) any woman permanent warrant officer of the regular service who, having completed not less than 20 years of active service, attains the age of 55 shall be retired on that date which is 60 days after the date on which she attains that age and shall be entitled to receive retired pay computed under subsection (d) of this section;

(2) upon the recommendation of a board of officers and in the discretion of the Secretary, under such regulations as he may prescribe, any permanent warrant officer of the regular service who has completed 30 years of active service may, with his consent, be continued on active service, but not beyond that date which is 60 days after the date on which he attains the age of 60. Any such warrant officer who has completed 30 years of active service and is not so continued on active service shall be retired on that date which is 60 days after the date on which he completes 30 years of active service and shall be entitled to receive retired pay computed under subsection (d) of this section; and

(3) the retirement of any person who, on the effective date of this act, is a male permanent warrant officer of the regular service and who upon attaining the age of 60 has completed less than 20 years of active service may be deferred until he completes 20 years of active service, but not later than that date which is 60 days after the date on which he attains the age of 64 if a permanent warrant officer of the Army or Air Force, or the age of 62 if a permanent warrant officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and the retirement of any person, who, on the effective date of this act, is a woman permanent warrant officer of the regular service and who upon attaining the age of 55 has completed less than 20 years of active service may be deferred until she completes 20 years of active service, but not later than that date which is 60 days after the date on which she attains the age of 60.

(c) Except as provided in clause (3) of subsection (b) of this section, each warrant officer shall be retired or separated not later than 60 days after the date on which he attains the age of 60 if a male warrant officer, or the age of 55 if a woman warrant officer.

(d) A warrant officer who is retired under this section shall, as determined by the Secretary, be retired in the permanent warrant-officer grade held on the day before the date of his retirement, or in any higher warrant-officer grade in which he has satisfactorily served, as determined by the Secretary, on any full time duty under competent orders specifying that the period of such duty shall be for a period in excess of 30 days or for an indefinite period. Retired pay under this section shall be $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the active duty basic pay he would have been entitled to receive if he had been serving on active duty in the warrant officer grade in which retired on the day before the date of his retirement under this section, multiplied by the number of his years of active service creditable in the computation of such basic pay, but not to exceed 75 percent of that basic

pay. A fractional part of a year that is 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of active service by which the $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent is multiplied.

(e) The retirement or separation of any warrant officer which is required under this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be deferred for a period of not to exceed 4 months when, because of unavoidable circumstances, proper evaluation of the warrant officer's physical condition and possible entitlement to disability retirement or disability separation benefits necessitate a period of hospitalization or medical observation which cannot be completed prior to the date retirement or separation would otherwise be required.

(f) The provisions of this section or section 13 shall not prevent any warrant officer from electing to be placed on the retired list in the highest grade and with the highest retired pay to which he may be entitled under any other law. However, when the rate of pay of such highest grade is under any other law less than the pay of any warrant grade satisfactorily held on active duty, the retired pay shall be based on the higher rate of pay.

ELIMINATION OF UNFIT OR UNSATISFACTORY WARRANT OFFICERS

SEC. 15. Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe and subject to the recommendations of a board of officers or a selection board under section 10 of this act, when the records and reports of any permanent warrant officer of the regular service indicate his unfitness or unsatisfactory performance of duty, he shall be retired if eligible for retirement under any provision of law, and his retired pay shall be computed as if he had been retired under the provisions of law under which such eligibility is established. If not eligible for such retirement, his appointment as a permanent warrant officer of the Regular service and any other appointment which he may hold in any warrant-officer or commissioned-officer grade shall be terminated. If a warrant officer being separated under this section has completed more than 3 years' active service since the date of acceptance of his initial appointment as a permanent warrant officer of the regular service, he shall be separated and he shall be entitled to receive severance pay under section 16 of this act, but in lieu of severance pay, upon his application he may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be enlisted in such grade as the Secretary may direct. If such a warrant officer has completed less than 3 years' active service since the date of acceptance of his initial appointment as a permanent warrant officer of the regular service, his appointment shall be terminated under section 6 of this act.

SEVERANCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 16. Severance payments under this act to permanent warrant officers of the regular service shall—

(1) if the warrant officer is being separated because of failure of selection for promotion, be computed on the basis of 2 months' basic pay at the time of separation for each year of active service, but not to exceed a total of 2 years' basic pay; and

(2) if the warrant officer is being separated because of unfitness or unsatisfactory performance of duty, be computed on the basis of 1 month's basic pay at the time of separation for each year of active service, but not to exceed a total of 1 year's basic pay.

A fractional part of a year that is 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of active service upon which to base this severance pay.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS ENTITLED TO PERMANENT WARRANT OFFICER GRADE

SEC. 17. (a) (1) Each person who holds a letter of entitlement to the appointment as a

permanent warrant officer of the regular service on the effective date of this act, and (2) each person who would, if his active service as a commissioned officer were terminated on the effective date of this act, be entitled, under section 1 of the act of July 14, 1939 (53 Stat. 1001), to reappointment as a permanent warrant officer of the regular service shall, on the effective date of this act, be tendered an appointment in the regular service to the permanent warrant officer grade established by this act which corresponds to the pay grade as a permanent warrant officer to which his status entitled him on the day before the effective date of this act. Warrant officers appointed pursuant to this subsection shall be appointed under section 5 (a) of this act and shall be included in any redistribution under section 4 of this act.

(b) After the effective date of this act, a permanent warrant officer of any regular service shall not be eligible to hold a commission as a Reserve officer in his own or any other service, except that—

(1) any person specified in subsection (a) of this section; and

(2) any person who is a permanent warrant officer of a regular service on the effective date of this act,

who holds a commission as a Reserve officer in his own service on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to continue to hold that commission, and without vacating his permanent warrant officer grade, he shall be eligible for service, promotion, or reappointment as a Reserve officer.

(c) If a person tendered an appointment as a permanent warrant officer in the regular service under this section does not accept that appointment, his entitlement to a permanent warrant officer grade shall terminate.

SUSPENSION OF LAWS AFFECTING WARRANT OFFICERS

SEC. 18. In time of emergency hereafter declared by the President or by the Congress and in time of war, the President is authorized, in his discretion, to suspend the operation of all or any part or parts of the several provisions of law pertaining to promotion, mandatory retirement or separation of warrant officers, of any of the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 19. (a) Section 1505 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "Any officer of the Navy of the grade of ensign or above on the active list who, upon examination for promotion, is found not professionally qualified, shall be suspended from promotion for a period of 6 months from the date of approval of said examination, and upon the termination of said suspension from promotion shall be re-examined. In the case of his success upon such reexamination he shall, if otherwise qualified, be promoted and assigned the date of rank and precedence in the higher grade which he would have held had he not been suspended and shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of such higher grade from the date upon which he became eligible for promotion. Officers of the grade of ensign who fail on such reexamination shall be honorably discharged from the service with a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active duty pay at the time of discharge for each year of active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve, exclusive of duty for training, but not to exceed a total of 1 year's active duty pay."

(b) The first section of the act of July 14, 1939 (53 Stat. 1001) is amended to read as follows: "That hereafter any enlisted man of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force who shall serve on active duty as a Reserve officer or warrant officer of the Army or Air Force or who shall be discharged to accept appointment as a commissioned officer or warrant officer in the Army or Air Force and whose active service as a commissioned of-

ficer or warrant officer shall terminate honorably, shall be entitled, without regard to any physical disqualification incurred, or having its inception, while on active duty in line of duty, to reenlistment in the grade held prior to such service as a commissioned or warrant officer, without loss of service or seniority and without regard to whether a vacancy exists in the appropriate enlisted grade: *Provided*, That application for reenlistment shall be made within 6 months, or within such other period of time as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe in exceptional circumstances, after the termination of such service as a commissioned officer or warrant officer in each case: *Provided further*, That enlisted men of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force shall be entitled to count active service as a commissioned officer or warrant officer in the Army and Air Force as enlisted service for all purposes."

(c) Section 2 of the Act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 652), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Original appointments to permanent warrant officer grades in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force shall be made only from among those persons who have served at least 1 year on active duty in the Army or Air Force."

(d) Section 3 of the Act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 652), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Whenever, under authorization from time to time made by the Congress, the total number of warrant officers serving on active duty (Regular warrant officers and all warrant officers of the Army of the United States or of the Air Force of the United States or any component thereof ordered into active military service for extended Federal service) exceeds the authorized active list warrant officer strength of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, with respect to the Army, and the Secretary of the Air Force, with respect to the Air Force, shall determine the requirements in each of the several warrant officer grades based upon the total number of warrant officers serving on active duty and the tasks being performed by the Army and the Air Force and such requirements in each of such grades may be filled by the temporary appointment of qualified warrant officers. Such temporary appointments shall be in the Army or Air Force and shall remain in effect at the pleasure of the appropriate Secretary. Persons appointed in the Army or Air Force as temporary warrant officers, while in active Federal service, shall while so serving, be entitled to the rank, pay, and allowances of the grades to which they are temporarily appointed, and shall be entitled to count such service as warrant or enlisted service for all purposes. Such temporary appointees shall be entitled to the benefits of all existing laws and regulations governing retirement, pensions, and disability as are applicable to members of the Army or Air Force when called or ordered into the active military service by the Federal Government under existing statutory authorizations. All persons temporarily appointed as warrant officers in the Army and Air Force under the authority of this section, shall, as long as they continue to hold such appointments, be available for assignment to active duty with any unit of the service in which appointed. Persons temporarily appointed as warrant officers under the authority of this section who, at the time of their respective temporary appointments have a military status in the Army or Air Force, may accept such temporary appointments without prejudice to the military status which they so held, and upon termination of such temporary appointments such persons may revert to the grades which they held at the time of their temporary appointments."

(e) Section 4 of the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 653), is amended by deleting

the last sentence of that section as it appears in lines 13 to 15, inclusive, of that section, page 653, volume 55, Statutes at Large, and by substituting in lieu thereof: "All warrant officers shall take precedence next below second lieutenants. They shall take precedence among themselves in accordance with the warrant officer grades established by the Warrant Officer Act of 1953, and they shall take rank within each warrant officer grade in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of their department."

(f) Section 5 of the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 653), as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom all of the section through the first three provisos as it appears in lines 22 to 34, inclusive, of that section, page 1085, volume 62, Statutes at Large.

(g) Section 1 of the act of October 21, 1943 (57 Stat. 574; 34 U. S. C. 643), is amended by substituting a period for the comma after the word "abolished," as it appears in line 5 of that section, page 574, volume 57, Statutes at Large, and deleting the remainder of that section.

(h) Title 14, United States Code, section 230, is amended to read as follows: "Any commissioned officer, except a commissioned warrant officer, who has reached the age of 62 shall be retired from active service, with retired pay of the grade with which retired."

ACTS AND PARTS OF ACTS REPEALED

SEC. 20. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are repealed on the effective date of this act, and this repeal shall include, but shall not be limited to the following:

(a) Sections 1405 and 1406 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Section 1 of the act of June 17, 1898 (30 Stat. 474).

(c) Sections 12, 14, and 15 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1007).

(d) That part of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 771), which appears in lines 10 to 23, inclusive, page 771, volume 35, Statutes at Large, as amended.

(e) That part of the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 942), which appears in lines 22 to 60, inclusive, page 942, and in lines 1 to 28, inclusive, page 943, volume 38, Statutes at Large, as amended.

(f) That part of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 573), which appears in lines 54 to 60, inclusive, page 572, and in lines 4 to 12, inclusive, page 573, volume 39, Statutes at Large, as amended.

(g) Section 12 of the act of March 4 1925 (43 Stat. 1274).

(h) Section 1 of the act of June 14, 1938 (52 Stat. 677).

(i) The first section of the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 651), as amended.

(j) The act of July 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 724).

(k) Section 2 of the act of October 21, 1943 (57 Stat. 574).

(l) The act of June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 210).

(m) Section 316 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 795, 867).

(n) Section 201 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802, 805).

(o) Title 14, United States Code, sections 303, 304, 305, 307, 308, and 313.

SAVINGS PROVISION FOR CERTAIN WARRANT OFFICERS

SEC. 21. (a) This act shall not affect any right, privilege, or benefit of any warrant officer under title 14, United States Code, sections 431, as amended, 432, or 433, as amended.

(b) In the case of a warrant officer distributed or redistributed under section 4 or appointed under section 17 of this act the term "active service" as used in this act, shall include all service which he has performed before the effective date of this act, and which under laws in effect on the day before the effective date of this act, would

be credited in determining his eligibility for retirement as a permanent warrant officer of the regular service.

(c) The effective date of the retirement of any person retired pursuant to this act shall be subject to the act of April 23, 1930 (ch. 209, 46 Stat. 253).

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 22. This act shall be effective on the first day of the sixth month following the month in which it is enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "1953" and insert "1954."

On page 2, line 7, immediately preceding the word "warrant", insert the words "permanent or temporary."

On page 3, line 12, after the words "warrant or", insert the word "any."

On page 3, immediately following line 16, strike out the word "REDESIGNATION" in the caption, and insert in lieu thereof the word "DISTRIBUTION."

On page 5, immediately following line 3, add a new paragraph 4 as follows:

"(4) Enlisted personnel heretofore or hereafter assigned to the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who have, or are entitled to have warrant grade pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act of July 24, 1941, as amended, will be distributed among the grades established by section (3) of this act as the Secretary may prescribe. Distribution effected in accordance with this paragraph will not serve to decrease the retainer pay or retired pay to which these persons are entitled under section 511 of the act of October 12, 1949, as amended."

On page 5, line 13, after the word "any", insert the words "permanent or temporary."

On page 6, line 4, strike out the period after the word "appointment" and insert the words "or commission."

On page 10, line 5, strike out the word "indicate" and insert in lieu thereof the word "establish."

On page 13, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "be entitled to severance pay under section 16 of this act."

On page 13, strike out lines 18 through 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) upon his application and in the discretion of the Secretary, he is enlisted in such grade as the Secretary may direct, or

"(B) if serving on active duty as a commissioned officer, he elects, with the consent of the Secretary, to remain on active duty in his officer status;

be entitled to severance pay under section 16 of this act."

On page 14, line 24, strike out the word "revoked" and insert in lieu thereof the word "terminated."

On page 16, line 11, strike out the word "retirement" and insert in lieu thereof the word "separation."

On page 16, line 15, after the word "deferred", insert the words "by the Secretary."

On page 16, lines 20 and 21, strike out the word "retirement" and insert in lieu thereof the word "separation."

On page 17, line 5, after the letter "(b)", insert the words "and in subsection (g)."

On page 17, line 22, strike out the words "his years of active service" and insert in lieu thereof the words "years of service creditable in the computation of such basic pay."

On page 18, line 17, after the word "is", insert the words "under any other law."

On page 18, immediately following line 19, insert a new subsection (g) as follows:

"(g) The separation of any person who, on the effective date of this act, is a male warrant officer of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces and who upon attaining the age of 60 has completed less than 20 years of satisfactory Federal service, as defined by sec-

tion 302, Public Law 810, 80th Congress, may be deferred by the Secretary concerned until he completes 20 years of satisfactory Federal service, but not later than that date which is 60 days after the date on which he attains the age of 64, if a member of the Army or Air Force, or age 62 if a member of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and the separation of any person who, on the effective date of this act, is a woman warrant officer of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces who upon attaining the age of 55 has completed less than 20 years of satisfactory Federal service, as defined in section 302, Public Law 810, 80th Congress, may be deferred by the Secretary concerned until she completes 20 years of satisfactory Federal service, but not later than that date which is 60 days after the date on which she attains the age of 60."

On page 19, line 1, strike out the word "indicate" and insert in lieu thereof the word "establish."

On page 19, line 24, change "Sec. 16" to read "Sec. 16. (a)."

On page 20, immediately following line 13, add a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The acceptance of severance pay under this act shall not deprive a person of any retirement benefits from the Government to which he would otherwise become entitled, but there shall be deducted from any such retirement benefits to such a person such portion thereof as is attributable to the active service in respect of which severance payment shall have been made to him under this act until the total of the deductions so made equals the total of such severance payment."

On page 21, strike out all of subsection (b) and reletter subsection (c) to read subsection (b).

On page 21, line 23, strike out the comma after the word "appointment" and insert in lieu thereof the words "within such time as the Secretary may prescribe."

On page 22, line 2, immediately after the word "emergency," insert the word "hereafter."

On page 24, line 14, strike out the word "warrant" and insert in lieu thereof the word "commissioned."

On page 24, lines 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, strike out the following: "(Regular warrant officers and all warrant officers of the Army of the United States or of the Air Force of the United States or any component thereof ordered into active military service for extended Federal service)."

On page 24, line 19, strike out the word "warrant" and insert in lieu thereof the word "commissioned."

On page 26, line 12, strike out the date "1953" and insert in lieu thereof the date "1954."

On page 26, line 19, strike out the words "that section."

On page 28, line 2, strike out the number "60" and insert in lieu thereof the number "59."

On page 28, line 3, strike out the number "4" and insert in lieu thereof the number "1."

On page 28, line 18, strike out the number "805" and insert in lieu thereof the number "807."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Of course, I interjected the observations I did so that the RECORD would be historically correct. My purpose in rising now is not to follow that through, but to make a few observations of some thoughts that have been on my mind for quite a while. I discussed them briefly

today with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. I discussed them briefly the other day with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Service Committee [Mr. SHORT]. I had no intention of making any remarks today, but this bill comes up by unanimous consent. I am glad the discussion took place, because it is very helpful to know the history of the bill and the reasons for it. I think now is the proper time to make a few remarks, at least to get my mind purged of some thoughts that have disturbed me considerably.

I have been very much concerned for some time about the feeling in the minds of those in our armed services, that the general public did not respect them as much as they should. I am talking now about all of the armed services, and I am talking about a matter that should be of deep concern to each and every one of us.

I want to say to the members of our armed services whether they serve as enlisted men or as officers that the American citizen respects the uniform of our country. When I walk along any street whether it is F Street in Washington or Washington Street in Boston or any place else and I see a person wearing the uniform of our country, whether it is a man or a woman, I respect that person because I have profound respect for the uniform.

My only purpose today is to make these few simple observations, in no way critical but trying only to be constructive in the hope that it may brush aside the mists in front of the eyes of some of those in the service. They should know that the American people profoundly respect the uniform and are deeply grateful to those who wear that uniform for the service they render and the sacrifice they make.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I am very glad the gentleman from Massachusetts has brought this matter to the attention of the House in this manner and to state that the Committee on Armed Services last year and now are trying objectively to correct the inequities that exist. We want to improve the morale of officer and enlisted personnel, and the passage of this bill I am sure will be helpful. Shortly we will take up again in the Committee on Armed Services the question of medical service benefits they are entitled to. The various things we are considering and doing I am sure will help build up respect for the armed services of the country, make them more attractive to the officer and enlisted personnel. Those who serve in our Armed Forces are entitled to it and we are working on it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to hear that. I know the gentleman and his committee are deeply concerned with it.

We can pass these bills, but it is a state of mind. I think the important thing for us to convey, and it can be done most effectively in the Congress because this is the people's body, is to let those

men and women wearing the country's uniform know that they have our respect.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad the gentleman has made these splendid observations. I, for one, realize every single day of my life that we would have no free country today if it were not for the men and women who have worn the uniform and are now wearing it. They have my deepest respect and my deepest gratitude. I thank the gentleman for what he is saying.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I think the treatment of the Reserves in 1950 did more to destroy morale among certain segments of the Armed Forces than anything else we have done in recent years.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure my friend from Iowa realizes I was not confining myself solely to a state of mind. I said in furtherance of or in addition to what the gentleman from Illinois said an important part is the state of mind of a person, and if those in the armed services know that the people of the United States have profound respect for them it will be a vitamin for them; we all like to have something that stimulates us because we are all human. I think one of the most important things we can do is to convey to those in the armed services the deep respect that the American people have for them and their uniform and the gratitude that we have for those services.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUGAR QUOTA INCREASE

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last week I briefly discussed on the floor the identical bills introduced by Members of the Louisiana and Florida delegations, both in the House and in the Senate, to increase the quota of the mainland cane sugar area from 500,000 to 600,000 tons of raw sugar.

Today, I want to explain our proposal in greater detail. Mr. Speaker, I would not trespass upon the valuable time of my colleagues in this body unless I felt that there was a real necessity for it. I hope you will indulge me a few moments, however, because the Louisiana and Florida sugarcane farmers are in a desperate situation.

Everyone who has studied the matter recognizes the seriousness of our problem including our Secretary of Agriculture,

Mr. Benson, who said so at a press conference in New Orleans on February 23, 1954 and who testified to that effect before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

At a press conference in New Orleans, Mr. Benson said:

I am sympathetic with domestic producers, of course. There are meetings going on in Washington right now on that very question, the sugar question. Increasing the production would require opening up of present legislation. What Congress wants I don't know, but I am inclined favorably toward it.

And at his appearance before the Senate Committee when he was seeking funds for the operation of his Department, Mr. Benson in answer to questions propounded by Senator DWORSHAK said:

Secretary BENSON. My sympathies, naturally, Senator DWORSHAK, are with our domestic producers. I met with the representative groups from Senator ELLENDER'S State when I was down in New Orleans recently. I met some of the people from Florida this week and had also met some of the beet growers.

Senator DWORSHAK. Could we anticipate some action instead of waiting until next session?

Secretary BENSON. Well, I don't know. Possibly it could be done. Of course, if the Congress wished it to be done, it would be done.

*** Of course, we do have some obligations to these other suppliers, as you know. We will have to look at the whole picture. I would be inclined to go a long way in helping our domestic producers.

In fairness, it must be said that on both occasions Mr. Benson pointed out that in order to give relief to Louisiana and Florida, the Sugar Act must be opened up or amended. That is obvious and we are perfectly willing to meet the issue strictly on its merits. For that purpose, as Al Smith used to say, let's look at the record.

Several years ago, the quota of the mainland cane sugar area was fixed at 500,000 tons of raw sugar. Since that time, our production has gradually increased, the figures for the last 5 years being as follows:

Year:	Short tons, raw value
1949 -----	519,000
1950 -----	560,000
1951 (due to freeze) -----	417,000
1952 -----	607,000
1953 -----	630,000

In connection with these figures, let me call attention to the following:

First. High production can be brought about in two and only two ways, either by increasing acreage or by increasing the yield per acre through greater efficiency. In our case the gradual higher level of production was brought about by higher yield per acre through greater efficiency, both on the farms and in the mills, with the wholehearted cooperation of the USDA. My best witness for that statement is Mr. Benson himself, who, in his statement before the Senate committee said:

Senator ELLENDER. It is not a question of increasing acreage in Louisiana and Florida as it is simply to permit us to plant the same acreage as we now have.

Secretary BENSON. That is true. You have had a great increase in the efficiency

of production. *** I don't know that we are entitled to all the credit; I think your State colleges and your factories have had a very important part.

Second. It is most important to understand, however, that while production has gradually increased for the reasons stated, the acreage has varied no more than 2 percent since 1948.

Third. And in the face of the fact that acreage has varied no more than 2 percent, the 1954 proportionate share determination cut the 1954 acreage 8 percent below 1953.

Fourth. The planted acreage this year is 20,000 acres less than in 1948, when the Sugar Act was renewed.

Fifth. Please bear in mind that we are not asking for an acreage increase. The point is that if the acreage quota to meet existing conditions is not granted this year, the USDA will impose an additional acreage cut of drastic proportions. This is a matter of simple arithmetic. Thus the quota under the Sugar Act is 500,000 tons of raw sugar; in January of 1954 we had a carryover of 190,000 tons, leaving a marketable balance for 1954 of 310,000 tons, with an expected production of over 600,000 tons. Even allowing for so-called normal carry-overs, it is perfectly evident that unless we obtain relief during this session of Congress the farmers in Louisiana and Florida will be compelled to plow-up thousands of acres of sugarcane lands.

Sixth. But that is not all. Unlike all other crops in the United States, sugar is produced in a cycle of from 3 to 5 years in Louisiana and Florida, cane planted one year being harvested as plant cane the next, and then recultivated and harvested as stubble cane for the succeeding 2 to 4 years. A plowup, therefore, would not only drastically reduce the acreage but would disrupt the cycle of production and destroy the farmers' capital investment in the stubble cane to come. To make it worse, most sugarcane growers produce no other cash crop and do not have a satisfactory alternative cash crop which they can grow on the acreage taken out of cane. Because of the vast differences in equipment, farm practices, and soil suitability and adaptability, a sugarcane farm can hardly be converted into a cotton farm; and even if it could, the farmers would be prevented from converting because of the cotton allotment program. Pray tell me, then, what would happen to the plowed-up acreage?

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that the Government would force our farmers to plow up thousands of acres of valuable sugarcane lands, disrupt their cycle of production, and destroy their capital investment when we consider that sugar consumption in the United States has increased every year. For instance, consumption in 1952 was 8,154,000 tons, and consumption in 1953 was 8,297,000 tons, an increase of 143,000 tons of sugar. There are many reasons why sugar consumption in the United States has increased every year during the last decade and will undoubtedly proportionately increase from year to year in the future. I want to point

out one factor because it is constant and because it again involves a matter of simple arithmetic; and that is population increase. The figures I mention are not my own, but were given to me just last week by the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture. Our population in 1954 will increase by 2,500,000 over the population of 1953. Based on our per capita consumption, this means that we will require 125,000 tons more sugar in 1954 than we consumed in 1953, due to population increase alone. And then in 1955 we will need 125,000 tons more than we will have consumed in 1954, and so on in the years to come.

Stated differently, in 1954, we will consume 125,000 tons more than we consumed in 1953, in 1955 we will consume 250,000 tons more than we consumed in 1953, in 1956 we will consume 375,000 tons more than we consumed in 1953, and so on.

The interesting question is who will be permitted to produce this pyramiding quantity of sugar in 1954 and succeeding years? Will it be our own farmers in the United States or will it be the farmers from Cuba and elsewhere? Let us make no mistake about the answer to this question, and for that purpose let us look at the provisions of the law itself.

Under section 202 (a) and (b) of the Sugar Act fixed quotas are established as follows:

Area:	Short tons raw value
Domestic beet sugar.....	1,800,000
Mainland cane sugar.....	500,000
Hawaii.....	1,052,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,080,000
Virgin Islands.....	12,000
Philippines.....	952,000
Total.....	5,396,000

Our consumption in the United States up to this time amounts to over 8,200,000 tons per year and, as I stated, will increase from year to year at least in proportion to the population increase. Who supplies the difference between fixed quotas of 5,396,000 tons and the actual consumption of 8,200,000 plus? Under section 202 (c) of the Sugar Act, Cuba receives 96 percent and all other foreign countries other than Cuba and the Philippines 4 percent.

And so, Mr. Speaker, unless our proposal is adopted, in addition to the amount it received in 1953, Cuba, in 1954, will receive 96 percent of the 125,000 tons required to meet population increase in that year and then will capture 96 percent of the mounting increase in 1955 and succeeding years, for the same reason.

Now, what does our proposal contemplate? We are not asking for an acreage increase. We are not suggesting that Cuba shall receive a lesser quantity in 1954 than it received in 1953. As previously pointed out, in 1954 our consumption will be 125,000 tons of sugar more than it was in 1953, due to population increase alone. We are only asking that we be permitted to retain 100,000 tons of the increase during this one year only. On their part, Cuba and the other areas will receive the balance of the increase in 1954 and then they will receive an approximate yearly increase of 125,000 tons

in 1955 and succeeding years. What is wrong with that?

Mr. Speaker, no one disputes that we have a just cause, but we have heard here and there that it might be better for us to wait until the next session of Congress for a remedy. But when a patient is desperately ill, a good doctor will not postpone the operation because he would like to go fishing. And when a house is on fire, a good fire chief will not fail to respond because he would like to attend the fireman's ball. If they failed to act, the patient would die and the house would be consumed. And so it is with the plight of the sugarcane farmers in Louisiana and Florida. If we wait until next year, it will be too late because unless we act now the big plow-up, under our cycle of production, will have to take place this fall. The responsibility for the harsh consequences of a drastic cut in acreage and for the destruction of the capital investment of our sugarcane farmers rests squarely on the shoulders of the administration through the Secretary of Agriculture. Following standard procedure, the bills we have introduced have been referred to Mr. Benson for an expression of the policy of the administration.

Mr. Benson has stated time and again that he is sympathetic to domestic producers. The time has come for him to take an affirmative position on this legislation. He has acquired a reputation for making up his own mind, and that is a noble attribute.

And so, Mr. Benson, we await your decision, and while you are making up your own mind let me remind you that the eyes of the domestic producers are upon you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER, for April 6, 7, 8, and 9, on account of hearings of Un-American Activities Committee at Albany, N. Y.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. McCormack), for April 5, 6, and 7, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. St. GEORGE and to include a statement.

Mr. COLMER.

Mr. D'EWARD, the remarks he expects to make during general debate today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include a tabulation of returns of his questionnaire on legislative issues.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 6, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1411. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended by the act of July 14, 1953, to improve the program of emergency loans, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1412. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the deposit of savings of enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1413. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1953, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C., sec. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1415. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C., 1254 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 8713. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Helium Act (50 U. S. C., sec. 161 (d)) and to repeal section 3 (13) of the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701); to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 8714. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey certain transmission facilities and related property in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to appropriate funds adequate to prevent the spread of the gypsy moth to areas not now infested; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their earnest efforts to have a new United States post office established in the town of North Smithfield; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to provide adequate fire and

flood protection in the national forests of southern California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of the Air Force Academy in California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to securing the land comprising Forts Baker, Barry, and Cronkhite for State park purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to granting the Territory of Hawaii statehood in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to survey of small-craft harbors; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 8715. A bill for the relief of John H. Orth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 8716. A bill for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8717. A bill for the relief of Alma Oleta Gentle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 8718. A bill for the relief of Miguel Saenz-Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 8719. A bill for the relief of Gualberto Estralla Alabastro, Pura Zarco Alabastro, and Arlene Alabastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

619. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Glenn D. Stokes and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

620. Also, petition of Mrs. Josephine Hudson and others, Sarasota, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

621. Also petition of A. V. Kelly and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

622. Also, petition of the lieutenant governor, Order of Ahepa, Empire State, New York, N. Y., requesting the assistance of the United States for the people of Cyprus in their struggle for their inalienable rights of self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein the following portion of my statement before the House Committee on Public Works this morning favoring the Lynn-Nahant Beach erosion project of Massachusetts:

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1954.

SECURE LYNN-NAHANT BEACH, MASS., AGAINST EROSION

Do not be misled by the word beach, which conjures up thoughts of pleasant loafing in the summertime.

The restless Atlantic is constantly nibbling at our land frontier, and during northeast storms its power and its fury are destructive.

Beaches are used for other purposes, such as the ones on the Normandy coast, and on every island where our men fought their way to landings throughout the Pacific.

Confining ourselves to the day in and day out erosion, it may be best to start off with a comment from the Bureau of the Budget, which, in a letter of April 26, 1951, addressed to the Secretary of the Army stated: "It therefore appears that the project (Lynn-Nahant Beach) is economically justified and that the proposed Federal participation to the extent of one-third of the construction cost meets the requirement of Public Law 727, 79th Congress. On this basis, I am authorized by the Director of the Budget to advise you that there would be no objection to the submission of the report to Congress."

The one referred to in the report is also detailed in Document No. 134 of the House of Representatives, 82d Congress, 1st session. This is a continuous beach comprising King's Beach Reservation in the town of Swamp-

scott, Lynn Shore Reservation in the city of Lynn, and Nahant Beach parkway in the town of Nahant, all in Essex County, Mass. The beach is 7½ miles north of the main entrance channel to Boston Harbor and 9 miles northeast of the city of Boston.

Lynn-Nahant Beach is paralleled for its entire length by excellent public highways which are separated from the beach proper by public walks and promenades. The only road to Nahant traverses the tombolo. The drive along the Lynn and Swampscott sections is part of a State highway route. The entire area is connected by excellent roads to all sections of the towns and to the principal traffic arteries of metropolitan Boston. Free public parking is provided for the entire length of the beach by parking areas and roadside parking. All parts of the beach are open without charge to the public. The mainland area is developed as a very fine park with concrete promenades and lawns in back of the seawall and at a level partially below that of the highway. The tombolo area is developed as a picnic area with free fireplaces, playgrounds, and bathing facilities. The bathhouse has accommodations for 3,000 people, with a charge of 25 cents being made for its use. Daily attendance at the beach in season averages 10,000 people with maximum attendance being 15,000 people. The usability of the beach is not impaired by water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers.

One benefit of this project would be to save the \$14,000 that has to be spent every year to repair direct damages caused by erosion.

Another benefit, in terms of increased patronage of the beach, and of increased valuation of private property due to improvement of the beach, is evaluated at \$27,720. Bear in mind that all property subject to damage is publicly owned, comprising the Metropolitan District Commission's reservation and the Nahant Road. While protection from storm and wave attack will increase its value, its public ownership will be retained and no return on the increased value can be realized. Hence no benefit is evaluated for this item, even though it leads to indirect benefits.

The inundation of the Nahant tombolo results in the complete isolation of the town of Nahant, population over 1,800. If the

dunes are allowed to be lost, storm waves will roll over the tombolo and sweep the beach materials into Lynn Harbor. The material could be periodically reclaimed by hydraulic dredging, but such a project would be of considerable cost and would probably not provide as satisfactory a beach as presently exists. Materials washed into the harbor would also shoal the channel of the Federal project which is adjacent to the tombolo. The isolation of the entire town of Nahant at any time creates serious problems of public welfare, since any emergency aid and relief required by a public disaster cannot be given by neighboring communities. The inundation of the single road for a short period can cause the loss of life of sick or injured persons who require emergency treatment in the major metropolitan hospitals. Should such isolation occur during a war period, national security would be imperiled, since access to major coast defense positions would be cut off. Intangible benefits of this type derived from the maintenance of the tombolo, while not susceptible to direct evaluation, are real and important benefits.

The average annual carrying charge is estimated to be \$28,000. The average annual benefits which have been evaluated are \$41,770. The ratio of benefits to cost is 1.5 to 1.

The total annual benefits to accrue from the project, evaluated and nonevaluated, are deemed to have a much greater ratio to the annual estimated carrying charges for the work than the factual ratio of 1.5 to 1.

Federal participation in the amount of one-third of the first cost is estimated at \$154,670. Average annual benefits are estimated at \$41,770 of which \$37,300 is general and public in character, and \$4,470 is to privately owned property. The Federal Government's share of the average annual carrying charges of \$28,000 is \$6,690. Responsible local interests, among other conditions, agree to assure maintenance of the improvements during their useful life.

For the foregoing reasons and because the insurance cost of this project is relatively small, I ask that the erosion control program for the Lynn-Nahant Beach area be approved and included in the omnibus river and harbor bill.